Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. SCC 8021 copy 1

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/truthdefendedins00elli

H. T. Ryall.

Jerome Bonaparte

TRUTH DEFENDED,

IN A SUPPOSED TRIAL

BETWEEN

INFANT AFFUSION AND BELIEVER'S BAPTISM.

SECOND EDITION,

REMODELED, CONDENSED, AND REVISED.

TO WHICH IS APPENDED,

A LETTER TO JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY, ESQ.,

ON

BAPTISM AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

SECOND EDITION,

REVISED AND CORRECTED.

BY

SEACOME ELLISON.

LONDON:
HOULSTON AND STONEMAN, PATERNOSTER-ROW.
LIVERPOOL:
D. MARPLES, LORD-STREET. JOHN WALKER, BOLD-STREET.
1846.

D. MARPLES, PRINTER, LORD-STREET, LIVERPOOL.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY.
REC. APR 1881

CONTENTS.

	Page
PREFACE	iii.
The TRIAL	1
The Counsel for the Plaintiffs' Address to the Judge and Jury	1
Evidence of the Witnesses for the Plaintiffs	33
The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Court	61
Examination of the Witnesses on the Christening of Infants, and how far the practice is in accordance with the Will of the Testator	93
The Counsel for the Defendant's Reply to the Jury	120
Examination of the Witnesses on John iii. 23.	154
The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Jury	159
Examination of the Witnesses on John iii. 5.	163
The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Jury	174
Examination of the Witnesses on Matt. xviii. 19; on Mark xvi. 16; and on Acts ii. 41.	195
The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Jury	202
Examination of the Witnesses on Acts viii. 36—39.	211
The Counsel for the Defendants' Reply	216
Examination of the Witnesses on the Baptism of Cornelius and his Friends, Acts x. 47, 48.	226
The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Jury	228
Examination of the Witnesses on the Baptism of the Jailor and his house, Acts xvi. 30—34.	232
The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Jury	236
Examination of the Witnesses on the Baptism of Crispus and his house, Acts xviii. 8.	248
Examination of the Witnesses on the Baptism of Stephanas, 1 Cor. i. 16.	249

Page

The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Jury - - - 252
Examination of the Witnesses on the Baptism of Lydia and her household, Acts xvi14,15. - - - - - - - - 254
The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Jury - - - 258
Examination of the Witnesses on Matt. xviii. 2--6. - - - 271
The Counsel for the Defendant's Reply - - - - - - - 284
Examination of the Witnesses on 1 Cor. viii. 14. - - - 314
The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Jury - - - 318
Examination of the Witnesses on 1 Cor. x. 1, 2. - - - - 330
The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Jury - - - 335
Examination of the Witnesses on 1 Peter iii. 21. - - - - 339
The Counsel for the Defendants' Reply - - - - - - 344
Examination of the Witnesses on Rom. vi. 3—5, and Col. ii. 12, 13. 354
The Counsel for the Defendants' Reply - - - - - - 370
On Christian Communion. Further Examination of the Witnesses 386
Reply to the Plaintiffs' Counsel - - - - - - - - - 432
Defence. The Counsel for the Defendants' Address to the Judge and Jury - - - - - - - - - - - - 533
Witness for the Defendants - - - - - - - - - 565
Address of the Judge - - - - - - - - - - 577
Verdict of the Jury - - - - - - - - - - 579

PREFACE.

THIS second edition of my work on Baptism has been remodeled and revised, and is now submitted to the public under another title, the one originally chosen having been generally deemed repulsive, especially by those who are unacquainted with the Greek language.

With a view to render the work more connected, and more convincing, I have controverted seriatim the arguments on each text of scripture brought forward by the Plaintiffs' Witnesses in proof of their claim to the blessings bequeathed; while to make manifest the wrong position which the Plaintiffs have taken up, I have entered extensively into their "sayings" and "doings." To strengthen the position of the Defendants, I have also entered largely into the bearing of the commission of Christ as it respects believers, and on the leading truths of the scriptures as they affect all men.

I have also introduced more characters as Counsel for the Plaintiffs, with their additional pleadings, which has of necessity increased the size of the work more than I at first intended; but I have greatly abridged the evidence of the Plaintiffs' Witnesses, which in the former edition was thought to be too prolix, extracting from their works only such passages as have a direct reference to the texts under discussion.

The extracts are given verbatim, save only where the alteration of a few words was necessary to make them read continuously. In no instance have I purposely added or omitted any sentence in order to alter its meaning, nor intentionally withheld anything through fear of combating it. And if in any instance I have put a wrong construction on the words of either Counsel or Witness, it has been by mistake, and not by design.

Those of my readers who may think the extracts not suffi-

ciently copious, I refer to the works from which they are taken; and, to facilitate the reference, I have given the chapter and verse of the scriptures, and the pages of the respective works.

The address to the Jury, in the character of Counsel for the Plaintiffs, is chiefly in the words of those who have written in favour of infant affusion, and against believers' baptism; and all the evidence of the Witnesses produced on their behalf is taken from their writings.

"The knowledge of the truth" is of such a nature, as to inspire the possessor of it with boldness to communicate it to others. It differs so much from everything of an earthly nature, that the more it is shared with our fellow-creatures, the more remains with the original communicator; and the ratio of enjoyment increases according to the number that partake of it. It is what the world can neither give, nor take away, nor appreciate.

To disseminate this knowledge is my object in the following pages, which were written after a careful examination of the works of a number of eminent and popular theological writers, some of whose publications are regarded as standard works, and are in general circulation. I have endeavoured to counteract the vital errors with which they abound, on that all-important point—the salvation of man.

On a comparison of the arguments used to establish the rite of affusion, and to overthrow the ordinance of baptism as instituted of God, I not only found, that no two of the writers were agreed on the meaning of the texts brought forward in their support, but that each of them, in one part or other of the same work, frequently differed from himself. Whence I inferred, that, to expose their errors, little more would be necessary than to place their several arguments in juxta-position; thus would their discrepancies be made manifest, and it would be clearly shown that they do not speak one language, "the language of Canaan;" while I saw, also, that my object would be most effectually accomplished by bringing the controversy on Baptism before the public in the form of a reported trial. In carrying out my design, I suppose the cause to have originated in the gospel fact, that the great Testator, "the Lord of Glory," has, by his last

Will and Testament, bequeathed to man a large and glorious inheritance, which shall be eternally enjoyed by every one who shall prove, by a uniform, practical conformity to all the requirements of the Will, his relationship to the Testator.*

I have supposed, for the sake of argument, that there is, between those who affuse infants and those who baptize believers, a dispute respecting the heirship, each party making an exclusive claim to the inheritance, each questioning the other's title, and each endeavouring to establish his own. The former, being the more numerous and influential, I have made the Plaintiffs; the latter, the Defendants.

After giving the leading facts of the case, in the assumed character of Counsel for the Plaintiffs, the several authors referred to in the Counsel's opening speech are introduced in succession, as Witnesses in support of his allegations, each one being supposed to give his evidence *in propriâ persona,* on each text of scripture discussed in the following work. In the evidence for the Plaintiffs, the reader will find an epitome of *all* that has been written in favour of infant affusion, will understand the bearing of it, and have it as vividly impressed upon his mind, perhaps more vividly, than if he had read the entire works of all the Witnesses.

The authors' names, the titles of their works, and the order in which their evidence is given, are as follows:—

First Witness.....Rev. Adam Clarke, LL.D., F.A.S.; Commentary on the New Testament.

Second Witness....Rev. William Burkitt, M.A., Expository Notes upon the New Testament.

Third Witness ....Rev. Richard Mant, D.D., Chaplain to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, (now Lord Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore;) Two Tracts intended to convey Correct Notions of Regeneration and Conversion. A new edition.

Fourth Witness—Rev. Thomas Scott; The Holy Bible with Explanatory Notes. And his Life,

* Matt. xii. 50.

by his Son. In the extracts from the latter, I have made the subject the speaker.

FIFTH WITNESS ..... Rev. TIMOTHY DWIGHT, S.T.D., LL.D.; System of Theology, and his Life. In the extracts from the latter, I have also made the subject the speaker.

SIXTH WITNESS ..... Rev. RALPH WARDLAW, D.D.; Dissertation on Infant Baptism. Second edition.

SEVENTH WITNESS .... Rev. GREVILLE EWING; An Essay on Baptism. Second edition.

EIGHTH WITNESS .... Rev. MICAIAH TOWGOOD; Dissertations on Christian Baptism. A new edition. Recommended by—Revds. David Bogue, D.D., J. Clayton, Sen., B. Cracknall, D.D., J. Dupre, D.D., T. Durant, T. Haweis, LL.B., M.D., J. Hooper, A.M., S. Lowell, T. Raffles, D.D., LL.D., J. P. Smith, D.D., and W. Thorpe.

NINTH WITNESS ..... Rev. RICHARD WATSON; Theological Institutes, Part 6th.

TENTH WITNESS ..... Rev. JOHN STEWART, D.D.; A Letter addressed to Mr. Henry Paice.

I have commented, freely and largely, on the productions of the Witnesses, and with as little acrimony as, from an advocate pleading the cause of his clients, could be reasonably expected. It is my misfortune to have been educated in a school where blandness of expression was not inculcated, but where a short quick manner of utterance was required. This must plead my excuse for not always replying to my opponents with that suavity and courteousness which would have been more agreeable to myself, and perhaps more pleasing to them.

Nevertheless, upon a subject of such vital importance, it would ill become me, confident that I have the gospel on my side, to speak, "smooth things," or to use "flattering words," at the expense of truth. It behoves me so to "speak, not as pleasing men, but God, who trieth the hearts;"* and I owe it

* 1 Thess. ii. 4. See also Gal. i. 10.

to the cause of which I am an unworthy advocate, to defend that "truth," regardless of whatever offence I may give to those who maintain a different doctrine, and who attempt to justify a perseverance in it. I am not aware that I have used harsher expressions, if any even so harsh, as by the scriptures I am authorised to do.* "It is only when we defend a cause in which we take little interest, that we permit ourselves to waive the use of strong terms."

That which I defend is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;"† and it shall eventually dispel the darkness, and give to all nations "the light of life."

After having scrutinized, and replied to, the claim of my opponents, as set forth in their works, I enter upon my defence, in which I state my views of the ordinance of baptism, of its institution and origin, deduced wholly from the scriptures; those infallible records, in which we find everything involving our salvation revealed in such plain, positive, and convincing language, that no one can fail to find it who searches after it "as for hid treasures."‡

I then give, in the character of Witness for the Defendants, a brief account of my life and experience; and conclude with two short addresses to the Jury, in the assumed character of Judge.

I trust the contrast exhibited betwixt my arguments and the conflicting and doubtful arguments of my opponents, will convince the impartial reader on which side the truth preponderates. My object is, to defend the truth of God as revealed in his word, to remove the veil cast over it by man, and to display it in its "perfection of beauty;" "not with enticing words of man's wisdom," for I have neither an inventive imagination, nor the power of language. I feel nevertheless assured, that the cause cannot suffer, even in my hands, seeing that "God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things

* See Prov. xxx. 6; Matt. xxiii. 15—36; Gal. i. 8, 9; Rev. xxii. 18, 19.
† Ephes. ii. 20. ‡ Prov. ii. 1, 5.

which are despised, hath God chosen, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are.'"*

How is it possible, it is often asked, that an individual can understand the scriptures, of which the world in general, and the learned in particular, all take different views? The enquiry is ably and justly answered by A. Knox, in his correspondence with bishop Jebb, in which he says, "The simple, correct view of christianity has very seldom been taken. Most men, of all ages, have sat down to the gospel with a set of prejudices, which, like so many inquisitors, have laid the christian religion on a bed like that of Procrustes; and, as it suited them, either mutilated it by violence or extended it by force."

When I commenced this controversy, six of the Witnesses were living; the subsequent decease of four of them has rendered no alteration in my remarks necessary. It will be seen that my animadversions upon the writings of those who still survive, are altogether as free as upon the writings of those who have ceased to live. It is not against individuals that I write, but against the doctrines of the sects with which such individuals are associated; and I look upon each sect as implicated in the authorised, or acknowledged, publications of those individuals. So far from bearing any of them personal ill will, I would that both preachers and hearers were "altogether such as" Paul was, in the full enjoyment of both present and prospective happiness. I know no way of attaining to the like happiness, but that of a scriptural regard to the commands of God, to the instructions of his well-beloved Son, and to the teachings and examples of his apostles. Where these are neglected, solid happiness is unknown. The means of salvation, as taught by the gospel, I have endeavoured to set forth; and if my work be a means of bringing one individual only to rely on the divine testimony, (regardless of the traditions of men,) and in that testimony to "find the knowledge of God," I shall esteem it a most abundant reward for all the time and labour I have bestowed to accomplish this great end; yea, a reward surpassing the "gain of the whole world."

It will doubtless be observed that, on several subjects, I have

* 1 Cor. i. 27, 28.

expressed different sentiments from those which I previously advocated. I hold that, if a further advance in the truth and light of the gospel lead to a change of sentiment, the avowal of that change* ought to be regarded as a virtue rather than a defect. After a close and continued study of the scriptures, during the last eleven years, (a large portion of which time I have been confined to the house by sickness,) and subsequently to the publication of my first edition, my mind has become, by the teaching of the Spirit of God, more enlightened; consequently I have more confidence in the correctness of my own views of the leading doctrines of the gospel, and thus I feel more courage than I felt before in the publication of them. Surely no blame can attach to the confession of former erroneous views, and the acknowledgment of having received further illumination, and approached nearer to the true standard.

I have often heard it remarked, that controversy is of little utility; and that, on account of the ill feeling it too frequently generates among different parties, it does more harm than good. That it does frequently generate this ill feeling is undeniable; but this affords no scriptural ground for withholding "the truth." The Saviour of the world said, "Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword."† This was not the purpose of his coming, but the immediate effect of it; and so it is now; people are offended when they read or hear of anything which militates against their preconceived opinions, or which has a tendency to disturb their apparent tranquillity. Like Israel of old, they are too apt to say, "Prophesy not unto us right things, speak unto us smooth things, prophesy deceits."‡ And it is manifest, by all we witness around us, that this speaking "smooth things" is destructive of the salvation of man; while the whole of the scriptures involve a controversy — maintaining truth, exposing error, denouncing disobedience, and declaring the dreadful punishments which await the rebellious.§ If the apostle Peter, in his day, thought it meet to "stir up the pure minds" of his dis

* See Prov. iv. 18. † Matt. x. 34.

‡ Isa. xxx. 10; see also 1 Kings xxii. 13; Mic. ii. 11.

§ See Isa. xxxiv.; Jer. xxv. 31—38; Hos. iv.

ciples,* how much more meet is it now to stir up the minds of those who are walking after their own devices.†

I can say, in the language of the apostle Paul, that "as much as in me is,"‡ "I have not shunned to declare.... all the counsel of God;"§ not as the representative of any body of people, nor at the suggestion, nor by the advice, of any individual. I therefore implicate no man, nor body of men. If I have erred, in any of my arguments or statements, (and where is the man that erreth not?) all the blame must rest on me; and although some of my arguments and statements may at first sight appear startling, yet, if they be a means of stimulating others to enquire after "truth," by searching the scriptures more closely for themselves,—"for they are they which testify of" Christ,‖—my labour will not be lost. It is a well known fact, that men seldom endeavour to prove the doctrine which from their infancy they have imbibed, until that doctrine is controverted; and it sometimes happens, that, in the very endeavour to confute the controverter, they become converts to the doctrine which their opponent maintains.

Now, with Him that hath proclaimed "the year of recompences for the controversy of Zion,"¶ and who hath the hearts of all men in his hands, I leave the following pages; confident that, if he see good, he can make them subservient to the purposes intended — his own honour and glory, and the eternal welfare of my fellow man.

* 2 Pet. i. 13; iii. 1. † Jer. xviii. 12. ‡ Rom. i. 15.
§ Acts. xx. 27. ‖ John v. 39. ¶ Isa. xxxiv.

THE TRIAL.

On the Judge taking his seat, the Counsel for the Plaintiffs spoke as follows: —

My Lord, and Gentlemen of the Jury,

I FEEL myself highly honoured in being chosen from among all my learned brethren of the bar to plead before you this Cause — this mighty Cause, on which depends the safety not only of the Church of England, the Church of the British Constitution, but also the well being of other churches, which, although at present separated from the former, are still in first principles one with her. I have little doubt, with the help of the faithful and intelligent witnesses with whom my clients have furnished me, that I shall bring this matter to a successful issue, — especially as I see before me a judge so enlightened and impartial, and an attentive and intelligent jury.

This cause, my Lord and gentlemen, has agitated the world for nearly 1800 years; and, although I have almost the whole of the religious community of Christendom for my clients, yet there are still some individuals, composing a small community, who, arrogating to themselves the right of private judgment, withstand them, and continue the agitation; for as often as any of my clients endeavour to expose their errors, so often one or other of their opponents endeavour to counteract them; sometimes in so specious a manner, as to make the justice of our cause to appear at least questionable. To bring this controversy to a termination, to silence for ever our opponents, and to consign to oblivion their delusive doctrines, is the object for which I present myself before you.

This trial, gentlemen, arises out of a difference of opinion entertained by two opposing parties as to the express meaning of two

particular clauses, (generally denominated the commission of the Lord,) in the Will or Testament which conveys to man a heavenly inheritance. I believe it is the opinion of many of the defendants, and that some of them go so far as to assert, that unless the requirements of the Will be fulfilled to the letter, or in that particular manner in which they contend the Testator designed they should be fulfilled, the parties so neglecting, or refusing to comply with, or acting in any way in opposition to them, thereby forfeit all right and interest in it. And further, they affirm that the particular clauses in question are expressed in language so plain, so familiar, and in terms so direct and positive, that none but those who are either wilfully negligent, or blinded by prejudice, or led away by the traditions of men, can put on them any other construction than that which, to the defendants, appears their manifest meaning. But, Gentlemen, from the evidence I shall adduce, supported by the greatest authorities in this kingdom, and by men the most celebrated for deep erudition in every country in Christendom, who have flourished throughout the period during which this cause has been agitated, I hope to convince you that the clauses in question legitimately admit of different constructions, and may be differently interpreted.

The clauses alluded to are expressed in the Will as follows: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20,) "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved," (Mark xvi. 16.) Now, gentlemen of the jury, before I advance further, I will inform you how my clients have proceeded in the acquirement of a correct knowledge of the Will; particularly of the two intricate clauses in question. The greatest portion of them, under the special favour and protection of the State, and aided by her resources, have spared neither expense nor labour to ascertain their true meaning. For this purpose, towns have been set apart, and sumptuous colleges erected and richly endowed, for the instruction of youth; to which the nobility, gentry, and affluent of the land send their sons.

To be well instructed in the nature and design of the Will is deemed a matter of such great importance, that with a view to induce a sedulous study of it, not only in the vernacular tongue, but in the language in which it was at first made known, the highest offices of the state, and the greatest honours that the reigning monarch can

bestow, are conferred on the most eminent of its students, even the dignity of taking precedence of all the nobles of the empire.

With such inducements to study, and such advantages as these, is it not natural to conclude that the best educated must be not only the most competent to form a correct judgment of the said clauses, but also to teach others how they are to be observed? And we therefore find that all those, without exception, who have been trained in the universities, and ordained for the purpose of explaining the doctrines and enforcing the commandments contained in the Will, are of one mind. Take, for instance, the command in the first clause. They insist that the primary meaning of the word baptize is to dip; that the command relates principally to new-born infants; and that the dipping of them is the baptism commanded by the Testator. But the observance of the command in this mode having been found by our ancestors inconvenient, and fraught with peril to delicate infants, they, to avert the dangerous consequences, substituted in its stead sprinkling, which has now, by common consent, become, among my clients, universal; and being sanctioned by the establishment, and approved by the pious, it is now regarded as binding as if it had emanated from the Testator himself. Then with respect to the second clause; in order to make it agree with the first, three persons, denominated sponsors, engage at the christening to represent the infant, to believe for it, and to promise in its name to "renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so" as "not to follow or be led by them." Should the child be healthy, there is a clause which limits the obligation of the sponsors to the period when it shall become of age, or until it shall be confirmed; if the child be ill when it is christened, no sponsors are required, but if it recover, it is grafted into the church through the medium of sponsors, who, in this case, have no limit to their engagement. Children so christened, as they grow up, are assured of their heirship; while, on the contrary, if they had been left to themselves, as I understand our opponents mean to insist they ought to have been, perhaps not one of a thousand, according to them, would have attained to that assurance. This fact, gentlemen, shows the necessity and utility of our mode of administering the rite, and of thus "grafting infants into the body of Christ's Church." After having been so grafted in, each individual, when he dies, is reckoned a member of one great family, and his remains are interred by one of

the clergy, with the following charitable and comforting declaration: "We commit the body of our *dear brother* to the ground, ... in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life." Those of my clients who witness this last and solemn ceremony, are thus informed that the departed has entered into rest: and they retire from the scene with the assurance that, in their turn, they in like manner will be passed into the same rest.

Thus you see, gentlemen, the church knows no distinction of character among her members; and how should she? Would it not be "a conceit which revelation warrants not, and which reason and experience disclaim," to have two kinds of services for baptized christians? Therefore it is that her clergy, in every instance, save that of those "who die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves,"—meekly beseech the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ to raise us up from death and sin unto the life of righteousness; that when we shall depart this life, we may rest in him, as our hope is this our *brother* doth." Behold, Gentlemen, the inducements which attach us to our beloved church, and which constrain us to uphold her to the utmost of our power.

My clients, gentlemen, contend, (see Letters to a Friend, by the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, M.A., Rector of Albury, Surrey,) that "as regards institutions and ceremonies of order, the" Will "proclaims its own insufficiency. The Apostle Paul enjoins upon the brethren to submit themselves to the rulers, which would be worse than useless if the rulers had no lawful authority to command anything beyond the letter of the scripture. To the Corinthian church the Apostle says, 'Let all things be done decently and in order;' and again, 'The rest will I set in order when I come;' and to Titus he says, 'For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee.' The Scriptures contain no detailed description of how Paul set things in order at Corinth, or Titus in Crete; and the omission was designed that other churches, in different circumstances, and ages, and climates, might enjoy christian liberty, while with wisdom and discretion they set things in order for themselves. The reason and the mercy of this is obvious, in a religion which was designed to extend to the north and the south, to the east and the west; a religion which was to gather its converts from the most cultivated, and the most barbarous of human tribes; and assemble its congregations in every varying latitude, from the burning sands of Guyana and Peru, to the icebergs on the coast of Norway.

"It follows then that the" Will "was never designed to be a sufficient guide in all the details of management in the Church of Christ. It is all-sufficient in principle. It invests the church rulers with true authority to enter into details, and it binds the members of the church to yield submission to the details so prescribed, though they be not written in the" Will, ... "In no case upon earth is it possible for the ultimate end of legislative authority to be the immediate director in every detail of the executive; therefore, general orders are indispensable, as the ground-work of delegated authority. To this infirmity of human management the Lord has condescended, in the history of his Church. He has employed the instrumentality of human rulers. The rulers are those who in the providence of God have the rule, whatever may be the form of church government. General orders are given in the" Will; "delegated authority is entrusted to the rulers of the Christian Church; and every regulation, every ceremony of the church, decreed by those rulers, (and not contradicted by scripture,) comes to the mind and commands the obedience of a christian churchman, as if it were a precept of scripture. (Pages 29, 32.)...So long as the laws and ceremonies introduced by the ruler are confined to matters which the" Will "has left undetermined or wholly unnoticed, they are to be obeyed for conscience' sake by all christian men." (Page 41.)...Therefore, "we ought to acquiesce in such rules as have been agreed upon by common consent, and which are recommended to us by long practice, and that are established by those who have the lawful authority over us. Nor can we assign any other bounds to our submission in this case, than those that the Gospel has limited. *We must obey God rather than man;* and we must, in the first place, *render to God the things that are God's*, and then *give to Cesar the things that are Cesar's.* So that if either church or state have power to make rules and laws in such matters, they must have this extent given them, that till they break in upon the laws of God and the Gospel, we must be bound to obey them. A mean cannot be put here; either they have no power at all, or they have a power that must go to everything that is not forbidden by any law of God. This is the only measure that can be given in this matter.

"But," gentlemen, "this, after all, is to make us the judges. In this one point undoubtedly it is; and to this end is the" Will "put into our hands; not as an all-sufficient guide, to supersede a living voice, a delegated authority, and a discretionary power, but as

a rectifier, an infallible standard, in opposition to which christian governors ought not to command, nor christian men to obey. Upon this one point, whether a law or ceremony is or is not contradictory to the "Will, "let every man judge dispassionately, and decide at his peril in the sight of God. But," gentlemen, "let no man imagine that he has any scriptural right to disobey a law of the state, or disregard a ceremony of the church, (however he may personally dislike it, or however inexpedient, or absurd, or vexatious he may consider it,) merely because there is nothing concerning it in the" Will: "on the contrary, if there be nothing concerning it in the" Will, "then it is clear it cannot be contradictory to the" Will, "and in that case the enactment of the ruler, (as I have already proved,) gives it the authority of the" Will "itself.

"Surely, then," gentlemen, "I may anticipate your agreement with me in the conclusion, that the common cry against many of the ceremonies of the church —Where do you find them in the Bible? is altogether unworthy of a place in the disputation of christian men, of enlarged and enlightened minds. The question is not, 'Are these ceremonies prescribed in the Bible?' but, 'Are they contradictory to the Bible?' It is not, 'Have the rulers authority to enact?' but, 'Have they transgressed the scriptural limits of their authority?' The distinction between rites and ceremonies to be observed for decency and order, and doctrines to be believed for necessity of salvation, must never be lost sight of. The authority of the church in reference to these two classes of things is wholly different.

"The church has scriptural authority to decree rites and ceremonies, in *addition* to what is contained in scripture, provided there be nothing in them 'contrary to God's word written.' But the church has no authority to enforce any doctrine in addition to what is contained in holy scripture. Doctrines in addition to the Bible, and ceremonies in opposition to the Bible, must be rejected, for conscience' sake. But ceremonies in addition to, and not in opposition to the Bible, if decreed by the ruler, must be received, adopted, and practised, for the same conscience' sake. This distinction is fully recognised, and very happily expressed, in Article 20 of the Church of England," (Pages 41 — 47.)...

"To deny her this power would be to supersede the use of the church altogether, since if those things which are in the scriptures left at large,— such as the mode, for instance, of celebrating the Lord's supper, the times and places of joint religious worship, &c., — if

these, I say, unspecified points, which must be determined by some one, are not to be determined by the church in each country respectively, the very purpose for which the" Testator "instituted the society is defeated; since, if she has any authority at all (which he expressly gave her), and has none in matters determined in scripture, she must have it in things *un*determined in scripture. In matters of discipline, the positive institutions of the church *make* things right and wrong which were left undetermined in scripture,— such as the observance of religious festivals, forms of public worship, administration of the sacraments, and things of that nature. And to disregard the authority of the church in matters of this description,— I mean, of course, in such cases where there is nothing ordained that is against scripture,— to consider things which were originally indifferent as indifferent *after* the church has enacted regulations respecting them, is an offence against Christ himself, the head of that body; not so great an offence, I allow, as direct rebellion against his own immediate commands, but as *truly* an offence. For christians should remember, that they cannot obey in many instances even the express commands of scripture, unless they comply either with some kind of ecclesiastical discipline, or with some unauthorised devices of their own instead....Unreasonable and unscriptural is it in any man to say, 'I will not conform to such and such a ceremony of the church, because there is no mention made of it in the scripture.' He has the Bible in his hand, commanding him to obey the rulers of the church: the rulers say, 'Do this;' and he replies, 'No, I will not do it, because it is not specified in the Bible'! The soldiers and servants of the gentile centurion shall rise up in the judgment with such a man, and shall condemn him; for that centurion was exercising a delegated authority under general orders, and when he gave particular orders to those under him, they obeyed him: he said to one, 'Go,' and he went; and to another, 'Come,' and he came; and to his servant, 'Do this,' and he did it. And verily I say unto you, that a greater than the centurion is here." (Pages 32— 34.)

Gentlemen, I repeat, (see a Treatise on Baptism, by the Rev. E. Bickersteth, Rector of Wotton, Herts,) "that the church has full right to appoint things not contrary to God's word, which those in authority judge to be for edification, is clear from the plain direction, 'Let all things be done to edifying.' 1 Cor. xiv. 26. That we ought to be subject to such appointments is clear, also, ver. 32. 34. 40. In these things the true fear of God calls not to dispute and

division, but charges us, 'Submit yourselves one to another in the fear of God.' Eph. v. 21.

"The institution of sponsors must be considered as an appointment of the church, judged meet for edification, and not directly as an ordinance of the word of God. We say directly, because, in human appointments, when not contrary to the scriptures, the divine rule makes them really obligatory on us. 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers:' 'Ye must need be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake.'

"It is certain that the institution of sponsors began very early in the christian church. Traces of it may be discovered in the writings of the fathers of the second, third, and fourth centuries." (Pages 137, 138.)

"Through the corruption of man, all the means and helps which God has given for his salvation have been perverted and abused, and given occasion, alas! to a more aggravated sin and heinous transgression." (Page 290.) "Thus baptism becomes a cover for delusion, a rest in an outside service, a charm to insure our salvation, and a putting off anxiety about the new heart, instead of encouragement to seek and attain it. Thus men are supposed to be made christians by baptism, instead of by being raised to a Christ-like, holy, and heavenly spirit. They rest in the shell of the ordinance, instead of gaining the inward blessing, which the ordinance contains for every true believer. We see this in its full power in Popery, and it has led there to all sorts of follies: baptism of bells, and horses, and asses, and everything calculated to degrade baptism, and make it absurd and ridiculous. There has also been in the Protestant church much of superstition in holding baptismal regeneration." (Page 294.)...

"It is too evident that really saving grace is not received by every baptised person. We see, especially in the apostacy of these last days, the chief proportion of those baptized growing up in sin, and living afar off from God; the wickedness of man thus rejecting the lovingkindness of God. Nor are we to conceive that to those thus living in sin, and continuing such an evil course, baptism has availed for their benefit." (Page 90.)...

"The subjects of baptism in the New Testament were, in the providence of God, at the commencement of christianity, not ordinarily of the same age, as the subjects of baptism where christianity is nationally received. The instances of baptism which we have

brought before us in the New Testament are chiefly those of grown up persons, come to full age....We say chiefly, because, as it will be seen afterwards, there are intimations, at least, of the baptism of younger members of a household. When christianity became generally established, infant baptism became almost universal. Indeed, the practice of infant baptism had become so general, that the Church of England provided, at the Reformation, no office for the baptism of adults. It was only found to be necessary after the time of the Commonwealth; when, amidst the various disorders of those days, the Baptists and Quakers had so multiplied, that it became desirable to have a distinct service for adults." (Page 93.)...

"The first requisite for baptism ... in the adult is repentance...the next is FAITH IN GOD'S PRECIOUS PROMISES. The order in which our Lord mentions faith and baptism, Mark xvi. 16, the receiving the word before baptism, Acts ii. 41, and other passages,... show the necessity of faith previous to baptism."...

"It is remarkable that the clearest passage, as to the necessity of faith before baptism, (Acts viii. 37,) should be an interpolation, as if to show that the strongest argument of the Baptists, the necessity of faith, can only be received by the same inferential reasoning, which they reject as proving infant baptism." (Page 102.)...

Here, gentlemen, I shall give you—

"THE WARRANT FOR INFANT BAPTISM, AND ITS DUE RECEPTION. It is one of the gracious truths of God's word, revealed for the unspeakable comfort of the church, that the children of believers are beloved for their fathers' sake, (Rom. xi. 28;) or, as it is beautifully expressed, (Deut. x. 15,) 'Only the Lord had a delight in thy fathers to love them, and he chose their seed after them, even you, above all people, as it is this day.' The tracing of this through the scriptures will show us the rich promises made to the children of those who love God, and how graciously they are in his sight regarded. (See Gen. vii. 1, ix. 9, xvii. 7; Deut. xxix. 10—13, xxx. 6; Gal. iii. 27—28; Psalm xxxvii. 26, ciii. 17, cxii. 2; Prov. xi. 21, xx. 7; Is. xliv. 3—5, lix. 21, lxv. 23; Jer. xxxii. 39.) But were not these promises peculiar to the Old Testament dispensation? Assuredly not! all the promises of God are yea and amen in Christ Jesus. They are all sure to the spiritual seed of Abraham. The great promise of the ordinance of circumcision was not a mere national and external good; it was a spiritual promise, (Gen. xvii.

7—11; Deut. xxx. 6,) and had a special reference to the Gentiles (Gen. xvii. 4—5; Gal. iii. 14,) in its fulness of blessing.

"The New Testament also has its gracious continuation of promises to children. 'His mercy is on them that fear him, from generation to generation.' And this in special reference to the spiritual blessings connected with baptism. 'For the promise (that is of remission of sins, and gift of the Holy Ghost, through baptism,) is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord shall call.'

"Even where one of the parents is unbelieving, the fulness of God's love is not restrained from overflowing to the offspring. (See 1 Cor. vii. 14.)

"We have also, as I would mention, in the last place, a concentration of every promise in the gracious acts and words of our Redeemer,—'Suffer little children to come unto me,' &c. (Matt. xvii. 5.)

"See then, in virtue of these promises, the true position of the children of believers before the Lord; they are partakers of covenant love, pronounced an heritage of the Lord, and blessed by him with explicit promises of the Holy Spirit, and a new heart, under the Saviour's express testimony, 'Of such is the kingdom of God.' Already from infancy admitted by circumcision into the Jewish church, and pronounced holy by an inspired apostle, as the offspring of a believing christian parent, who may then, without an express prohibition, refuse their admission by baptism into the Christian church? As far as regards personal qualification, the requisitions which the Jewish children had for circumcision, the christian children have for baptism, the only exception being, circumcision was confined to the male children, and the precise age of the Jewish child was pointed out; and in the larger scheme of the gospel the distinction of male and female is lost, (Gal. iii. 28,) and no age is specified, that no age may be excluded." (Pages 105—108.)...

"When the evidence of *early infant* baptism is brought forward, our Baptist brethren are accustomed to say, there was also evidence in the early church, during the third, fourth, and fifth centuries at least, of *early infant communion.* The answer here is very simple and clear. Infants are capable of dedication to God, learning, and salvation; infants are not capable of remembering Christ and fellowship with his people. We do not receive any customs because they

may have been long practised, or being ancient, but because they are scriptural, or not unscriptural, and tend to edification. The church of Christ at large, therefore, has never received infant communion; but the church of Christ at large has ever held infant baptism. An infant may be capable of inheriting an estate, and yet quite incapable of enjoying it." (Page 114.)...

"Having," gentlemen, "thus prepared the way, we may now more summarily notice the express scriptural warrant for this practice.

1. "THE CLEAR AND NUMEROUS PROMISES OF GRACE TO THE CHILDREN OF BELIEVERS, is already brought forward.

2. "THE COMPREHENSIVENESS OF THE COMMISSION, '*Go ye, and train up as disciples all nations, baptizing them.*' It is clear that the term nations includes infants. There is not merely no prohibition against the practice, but the command includes the class in consideration. And when we remember that infants were members of the Jewish church, and that the christian dispensation was never designed to contract, but was designed to enlarge and extend, the manifestations of divine grace, we cannot but justly view them as designedly comprehended in this commission. Our Baptist brethren ask for a command, and urge obedience. Here is a plain and positive *inclusive command.* 'Let them obey the Lord of heaven and earth.' (Page 118.)...

"The care of God over his church, in not more explicitly commanding by positive and direct institution, *appointing* the baptism of infants, is strikingly seen, from the perverse use made of their baptism without such direct institution. Self-righteous formalism grew to a prodigious extent under the outward services of Judaism, and the simple rites even of Christianity have been abused to the undue magnifying of the priesthood, and of the sacraments. If with so little that is said upon the subject, and infant baptism itself flowing rather from inference than positive appointment, men have ventured to identify baptism and regeneration,—had then such baptism been more prominent in the scripture, we may easily conceive how much more extensively it would have been abused. The omissions of scripture are full of instruction." (Page 121.)...

Gentlemen, "The baptism of infants admirably corresponds with the benevolent and gracious character of the gospel, or the good tidings of great joy to all people, as a system of rich, free, sovereign, and unmerited grace. Here God meets us at our very birth with a

provision of mercy, introduces us into the bosom of the church, and brings us into the sympathy and prayers of his family. Hence even those who have not been able to see the *scriptural warrant* for infant baptism have yet judged it to be so valuable, as an institution even of the church, that christians should on that account adhere to it. But it is indeed the wisdom and the love of God *in his word*, rather than the wisdom given to the church, which is the true and solid foundation of infant baptism." (Page 123.)...

"When once the abuse of infant baptism became so wide-spread and almost universal, faith disregarded and the outward ordinance only trusted in, and, the profession of christianity having become general, there was no corrective in frequent adult baptism, the providence of God suffered a body to arise in the church who denied all efficacy of baptism whatever, but on profession of faith, and thus virtually set aside the reality of divine grace in that ordinance, as an object of faith. Just as, when the church sunk into idolatry, it pleased God to suffer an impostor to arise, holding one great truth. And Mahomet was the rod of christians, charging them justly with infidelity because they were idolatrous: so Baptists rebuked the *opus operatum* of Popery and formality, by teaching the responsibility of man in regard to baptism." (Page 165.)...

"While I rejoice," gentlemen, "in the thought, that the consistent piety and real devotedness to God our Saviour of many who reject infant baptism entitle them to brotherly esteem and cordial affection, their unscriptural error on this point is connected with many serious evils, and I would venture to address them upon these evils. They think that they are giving a decided proof of deadness to the world and devotedness to Christ, by the very act in which they run counter to his gracious institution. Differing in this from so large a proportion of their brethren, their time, and thought, and strength are necessarily for self-defence given to an outward ordinance; and in our view given to what he has not required, instead of being given to advance his kingdom and glory; and thus unprofitable disputes have occupied and distracted the minds and talents of the true followers of Christ." (Page 353.)...

"The unbelief of the church in God's promises to the baptized has been carried out in a corresponding and increasing unbelief in their education, just as it is the property of one sin to beget many similar sins; and the consequent inconsistency of the baptized has reacted in evil, weakening the faith of the church in baptismal

blessings, till we are brought to that awful state of mere nominal christianity, which now palsies the whole professing church, and makes our beautiful baptismal service almost a dead letter, and a grand stumbling block of the whole body of dissenters." "Oh, were faith but in exercise in ministers and people, in parents, and sponsors, and worshippers, what a spiritual energy would accompany our baptismal services, till we attained the blessed prospect held forth by my beloved friend Mr. Budd, of infant baptism being the means of national reformation." (Page 360.)

"Baptism," (see Regeneration and Baptism Considered, by Francis Russel Hall, B.D., Rector of Fulbourn St. Vigor's, Cambridge,) gentlemen, "when it is *rightly received*, the *Holy Ghost is received*, regenerating the heart. But we observe baptized children who appear in no respect to be renewed, therefore they did *not receive baptism rightly*. But how is this? Unhappily their baptism was looked upon as a *ceremony;* their natural condition was out of sight. They were not brought by faith and prayer to Christ, and, therefore, he did not baptize them with the Holy Ghost. He did not take them up in the 'arms of his mercy,' and he did not 'bless them in turning them away from their iniquity." (Page 16.)...

"Augustine,...in his answer to Pelagius, who denied original sin, he asks him,—Are not the words of the apostle concerning baptism, when he says, 'As many of us as were baptized in Christ, were baptized in His death?' he so explains it as to say, that he who is baptized in Christ *dies unto sin*, as Christ died in the flesh; because, to be baptized in the death of Christ is nothing else than to *die unto sin*. Unto what sin, therefore, does an *infant die*, if it has not contracted *original* sin? For are not infants baptized in the death of Christ? seeing the apostle does not say some of us, but '*as many* of us as were baptized in Christ, were baptized in his death.'"...

"Secker says, 'The practice of baptizing by immersing the person under water, thereby burying him, as it were, in the water, and raising him out of it, was anciently the more usual method, on which account St. Paul speaks of baptism as representing both the death and burial and resurrection of Christ, and what is grounded upon them, our *being dead and buried to sin*, renouncing it, and being acquitted of it, and our rising again to walk in newness of life.'" (Pages 87, 88.)...

"Bazil remarks, 'Faith and baptism are the *two means of salvation*, adhering together and inseparable. Faith is made perfect by

baptism, baptism is dependent on faith, — each has respect to the same names. For as we believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, so are we baptized in the name of the Father, &c. Indeed, confession goes before, leading to salvation, but baptism follows, *sealing* our confession and covenant." (Pages 101, 102.)...

"Baptism," gentlemen, "is the *surer* way. If we baptize infants, and they ought not to be baptized, our baptizing them, if it can do them no good, can *do them no hurt*....But if they *ought* to be baptized, and we do not baptize them, we do them inconceivable hurt....I will not take upon me to say that we prevent their final salvation, or that we prevent our own, but we may do them hurt for many years; how far, and how long, we know not. That we grievously *hurt ourselves*, I do not hesitate to say....And there is some reason for what Augustine says, 'Our mother, the church, lends to them the feet of others that they may come, and the heart of others that they may believe, the tongue of others that they may confess; that, seeing they are burdened by another's sin, they may be saved by another's confession." (Pages 138, 139.)...

"Hooker is more to the point. He observes, (page 182,) 'If Christ himself, who giveth salvation, do require baptism, it is not for us, who look for salvation, to sound and examine him whether *unbaptized men may be saved*, but seriously to do that which is required, and religiously to fear the danger which may grow by the want thereof. ... *Baptism, in the meaning of the law of Christ, belongeth unto infants, capable thereof from the very instant of their birth*, which, if they have not howsoever, rather than lose it by being put off, the church, as much as in her lieth, wilfully casteth away her sons.'" (Pages 184, 185.)

"Calvin observes, on this text, (Acts ii. 38, 39,) 'We must mark these three steps, — that the promise is made first to the Jews, then to their children, lastly that it is shared equally by the Gentiles also.... Peter, therefore, observes the proper order when he assigns the first place of honour to the Jews. That he makes their children partakers with them, rests on the promise, "I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee;" where God adds the children to the parents in the grace of adoption. This place, therefore, abundantly refutes the Anabaptists, who drive from baptism the little children of the faithful, as if they may not be members of the church. They take refuge in an

allegorical sense, and consider those as children who are spiritually born. But they get nothing by their stupid impudence. It is evident that Peter said this, because God had adopted one nation in particular. But circumision was a proof that the right of adoption was common to little children. As, therefore, God made a covenant with Isaac, though not born, because he was Abraham's seed, so Peter affirms that all the children of the Jews are included in the same covenant, because of the perpetuity of the promise, "I will be the God of thy seed." And to enlarge the grace of Christ, he declares to the Jews that the Gentiles also were to be partakers with them. Therefore he uses the expression 'call,' as if he said, As God gathered you by his word into one people first, so the same word will sound forth every where, that distant people may come to you, when they have the new invitation of God.'" (Pages 191—193.)...

"It is not fair, indeed, on the part of our opponents, to demand an instance of infant baptism in the days of the apostles, in order to determine the question of right. For surely there may be a history of *a rule*, without the history of *its application*. We are not informed that all the apostles were baptized. There is no recorded case of women being admitted to the Lord's supper; yet no one doubts that they were admitted, *on the general principle* that all were to receive it that could receive it, and were fit to receive it. And doubtless it was safe to argue that infants were baptized, on the principle that they stood in need of, and were capable of receiving, baptism and regeneration. It is not improbable, however, that there is an instance of infant baptism. It is furnished by the history of the conversion of Lydia, and that of the jailor and his family. Acts xvi. 12—33. Now, of the *faith* of her *household*, and of *their hearing* Paul and Silas, not a word is said. But the circumstances in reference to *her* are dwelt upon. '*She* worshipped God;' '*she* heard us;' '*her* heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul;' '*she* besought us, saying, If ye have judged *me* to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us.' Why is this marked difference between *her* and *her household?* Why are they passed over, almost in silence? Why does the inspired historian treat *them* as of small importance? Would he have said so little, had they been only *household servants* who believed....It is not

unworthy of remark that Lydia's *trade was mean*, and could neither *require* nor *support* even a *few* servants.

"Let the account," gentlemen, "before noticed, of the baptism of Lydia and her household, be compared with the account given of the baptism of the *jailor* and all his, shortly after, at the same place. In the latter case, it is distinctly stated, that the apostles spake the word of the Lord unto him, and to all that were in his house; and that he believed in God with all his house; and that he and all his were baptized straightway. Here *the household makes a conspicuous figure* in the narrative; its circumstances are specified with a degree of minuteness wholly unaccountable, upon the supposition that the *two cases are alike*. But suppose, what I cannot but think to be highly probable, that Lydia's household were incapable from their tender ages of hearing and believing the word of life, and the two cases are naturally stated,—just as one would expect to find them stated, by an historian who wrote with the express design of *directing the church* till the kingdom of God should come.

"But should I," gentlemen, "have been mistaken in concluding that the designed alteration in St. Luke's language in his latter account, amounts to a tacit declaration that he is describing a case widely different from the former, the result would only be that the New Testament *is without an instance* of infant baptism, a thing not extraordinary, if the *conciseness* with which it is written, and the ample proof it affords of the general necessity of baptism, and the *reluctance* of *parents* in particular to embrace a religion everywhere spoken against, if not oppressed, and the *nature* of the questions which were *most likely* to take up the attention of the church, be considered. Still, the argument for infant baptism would not be weakened; it would not, indeed, be able to occupy the vantage ground which an *instance* would give it, but it would be immoveable, resting on the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever. But," gentlemen, should my "conjecture be *right*, (and there is good reason for thinking it is so,) the question would be settled, as is on all hands agreed." (Pages 209—211.)...

"Children, indeed, are in such a state of dependence, that parental and ministerial responsibility is grounded upon it; forasmuch as a parent receives his child a perfect blank, a mere 'rasa tabula,' as to any guilt actually contracted by him, and consequently may write upon him what he pleases." (Page 217.)

Gentlemen,—(see A General Review of the Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, by the Right Reverend CHRISTOPHER BETHEL, D.D., Lord Bishop of Bangor; third edition.)—"In matters indifferent, it was a wise and just policy to retain those ancient and decent usages to which the people had been accustomed. But the learned and pious divines to whom the management of our reformation was entrusted, while they retrenched with an unsparing hand the superstitious practices and unsound doctrines of Popery, did not renounce either the tenets or the usages of the apostolic and universal Church merely because they had been held, and in some cases perhaps perverted, by the Church of Rome in the days of its ascendancy. They were content to lop off excrescences, and to remove corruptions, without destroying the substance of primitive and catholic doctrine.

"Taking for granted that the doctrine of infant baptismal regeneration is a Popish tenet bequeathed to us by the policy of Elizabeth," it is brought forward by some "as a strong prejudice against it, and as a symptom of its papal origin, the fact that it places the spiritual condition of the human soul at the discretion of a fellow creature. But" they "seem to forget that this is in accordance with the state and circumstances of our common nature; that the spiritual, no less than the temporal, welfare of children is deeply involved in the care and faithfulness of those to whom they are entrusted; and that whenever a duty connected with the happiness of our fellow creatures is imposed on such frail and sinful beings as we are, it may be, and too often is, neglected, at the hazard of their best interests. But the Church of England," gentlemen, "does not put any harsh construction on the case of infants dying without baptism. We hold, indeed, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved; but we do not hold that infants dying without baptism are undoubtedly damned; and though we do not venture to speak peremptorily of their condition, we leave them without despair or distrust in the hands of a merciful Saviour." (Preface 6, 7.)...

"Again," gentlemen, "it is admitted, I believe, by all who hold the doctrine, that the grace bestowed in baptism is one simple act of the Holy Ghost; that even in this kind, (*i. e.*, the participation of infused grace,) the first beginning of life, the seed of God, the first fruits of the Spirit, are without latitude, are bestowed equally on all, without degrees or variety. But we cannot conceive of repentance, or faith, or any of those religious graces which are often identified

with regeneration, as existing otherwise than with latitude. They are dispositions, or habits of mind, which necessarily imply in different subjects different degrees of strength and weakness, progressive improvement or gradual decay. On the other hand, such a change of spiritual state and circumstances as we suppose to take place in baptism is a simple, simultaneous act, which cannot be better illustrated than in the language of Hooker, when arguing against the iteration of baptism; 'for how should we practise iteration of baptism, and yet teach that we are by baptism born anew — that by baptism we are admitted into the heavenly society of saints — that those things be really and effectually done by baptism, which are no more possible to be often done than a man can naturally be often born, or, civilly, be often adopted into one stock or family? As Christ has therefore died and rose from the dead but once, so that sacrament which both extinguisheth in him our former sin, and beginneth in us a new *condition* of life, is by one only actual administration for ever available.'" (Preface, 24—26.)...

"When opinions founded on current and acknowledged interpretations of scripture have been received without doubt or dispute, from the earliest times of christianity to a comparatively late age, the prejudices in their favour, and against the innovations which have been made upon them in latter days, are fair and legitimate. There seems indeed to be some presumption in setting up our private opinion and interpretations against the unanimous testimony of the early christians, and it is evidently dangerous; for if we will not admit their unvarying and uncontradicted testimony in proof of an apostolical and scriptural doctrine, I know not how we shall convince an unbeliever that they are sufficient witnesses of the authority of sacred writ, or of the authority of its canon."...

"It has," gentlemen, "been shown, beyond any reasonable doubt, that all the ancient christians, not one man excepted, do take the word 'regeneration' to signify baptism; and all of them do understand that rule of our Saviour, 'Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of heaven,' of baptism. After what has been written on this subject, it will be needless to adduce passages of their works in proof of these positions, which are legitimate deductions from plain matters of fact, and a laborious investigation of their writings." (Pages 10, 11.)...

"But it must be observed that baptism is a symbolical action, and that it not only symbolizes the mysterious change wrought in us in the sacrament, which is its inward and spiritual grace, but the

moral and practical change to which it binds us. Hence the same class of figurative expressions which denote the mystical, frequently denote the practical change likewise. Thus we *die to sin*, or *die with Christ*, in baptism, because our sins are then forgiven, and we cease to be sinners in God's sight;—we *rise again*, because we are then accepted and adopted by God, and made partakers of a principle of spiritual life;—we are 'crucified with Christ,' we 'put on Christ,' or 'put on the new man,' in baptism, because we then become united and conformed to Christ, and are made new creatures in the eye and estimation of God." (Page 38.)...

"We may observe that, according to the doctrine of scripture, such a change as that which we denominate regeneration does actually take place in baptism. Christians are represented as receiving remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost, in baptism; as being *saved by baptism; washed, sanctified, and justified;* as being buried with Christ *by baptism into death; buried and risen again with Christ* in baptism; *crucified with Christ, putting on Christ; in baptism, sealed and anointed;* endowed with *the earnest of the Spirit*, and the spirit *of adoption; and circumcised with the circumcision of Christ made without hands.*' Now all these expressions terminate in a mysterious collation of grace, and a passage from a carnal state in Adam, to a spiritual state in Christ; or, in our admission into this latter state, carrying with it the forgiveness of sin—the gift of the Holy Ghost—and a covenanted and conditional title to everlasting happiness." (Page 55.)...

"There is nothing," gentlemen, "in the apostle's words which can allow us to separate regeneration from baptism, or to affirm of any *living* disciple of Christ that he has been *born again, born of God, or born of the Spirit*, previously to this sacrament." (Page 74.)...

"When our reformers settled the discipline, laid down the doctrine, and compiled the Liturgy of our national church, they wisely determined to make no unnecessary changes, nor to introduce any novelty in religion, but to place everything as much as possible on the same footing on which it stood before the corruptions, which they were removing, had found their way into the church of Christ. Hence they did not sit down to the study of the scriptures with a view of extracting from them a new form of doctrine or discipline, but they brought every opinion to the test of scripture, and allowed none to be valid and binding but what were, as they were persuaded, fully borne out by the authorities of the sacred volume. They likewise

diligently inquired into the writings of the ancient christians; and having satisfied themselves, upon the common principles of experience and investigation, that the doctrines *universally* received into the churches in their days were agreeable to the truth, they were so far from refusing the assistance which they furnished them in the compilation of our Articles and Liturgy, that they avowedly acted on the principle of conforming as much as possible to their opinions and phraseology....

"Many of the prayers," gentlemen, "contained in our Service Book, are the same, or nearly the same, as were in use previous to the reformation. It appears that the compilers of our Liturgy were anxious to retain such portions of the ancient services as were consistent with sound doctrine, and free from the corruptions of the Church of Rome." (Pages 77—79.)...

"They (the Articles and Liturgy,) teach, in common with the writings of the ancient Christians, the necessity of faith and repentance, as qualifications for the salutary effects of baptism; but they never contemplate any person, however qualified, as regenerate, till he is actually baptized.

"They suppose that infants, who are necessarily free from actual sin, are duly qualified for baptism, and are looked upon by God precisely in the same light as penitents and believers; and they unequivocally assert that every baptized infant, without exception, is born again." (Page 91.)...

"Infants, therefore, in this respect, stand precisely on the same footing with worthy adults; and there is no more reason for supposing that God discriminates between different infants, than that he discriminates between adults who are equally endowed with faith and repentance." (Page 100.)...

"It has indeed," gentlemen, "been confidently affirmed, in opposition to the tenets of our church, and scripture, that true grace is indefectible; that no man therefore is regenerated in baptism who does not keep his baptismal contract; and consequently, that habitual holiness is the only test of spiritual regeneration. We, however, do not imagine that God regenerates our infants on principles of favouritism and caprice, because baptism is too frequently unproductive of practical and saving effects; but we ascribe this failing to human negligence and default. Though the stipulations of the sponsors as proxies for children are rather a pious and salutary custom of the church than a necessary part of baptism,

every baptized person virtually contracts the engagements which those stipulations contain; and parents and guardians of infants are bound, without any formal professions, to second and promote the good work which God has begun in them, by religious instruction and moral discipline; for the child of God is necessarily trusted, in his early years, to the care and institution of human parents, and it depends much on their vigilance and faithfulness to their trust, whether that spirit which has been consigned over to him in baptism shall remain dormant, or be brought forth into play and activity, whether he shall be spiritually born only, or shall grow up in habits of spirituality and holiness.

Gentlemen, "there are, however, persons who think that this necessary connexion between baptism and regeneration, which results from the obvious construction of scripture and our baptismal offices, is untenable upon principles of reason. In their opinion, common sense forbids us to suppose that baptism, which is the work of man upon the body, is ordinarily accompanied with regeneration, which is the work of God upon the soul; or that the sprinkling of the human body with water can be followed by a change of this magnitude and importance. But surely it becomes us rather to accept God's boons and bounties in the way which he has prescribed, with humility and thankfulness, than to bring his ordinances and revelations to the standard of our own reason. If a doctrine has no foundation in scripture, or is only built on a *few obscure* passages, whilst it is contradicted by *the whole tenor and current* of Holy Writ, these are good grounds for its rejection; and we shall generally find that the support which it seems to derive from scripture may be removed, by the aid of received and general principles of interpretation. But where a doctrine is in no sense *contradictory* to reason and experience, where it harmonises with the whole system of revealed religion, and where the language in which it is contained is plain and intelligible, it has every claim to our assent, and ought not lightly to be called in question. For my own part, I am at a loss to discover why this doctrine is more unreasonable than the doctrines of original sin, the incarnation of the Son of God, atonement by his blood, or the resurrection of the body; and why it is not to be received with the same assurance of faith, and the same freedom from sceptical doubts and ambitious curiosity." (Pages 125, 126.)...

"Though the doctrine of original sin is plainly deducible from scripture, it is a subject on which it touches with a moderate and

sparing hand; and it certainly does not warrant the exaggerated descriptions of our natural and necessary condition as fallen creatures, which are to be found in the writings of divines, and in some popular systems of theology. Scripture uniformly speaks of the sinfulness of man in a practical and experimental manner; it lays before us a series of observations, arising out of particular facts and occasions, or out of a general view of the conduct and character of that portion of mankind with which the inspired writers were conversant. But, besides the conclusions which are deducible from scripture by means of analysis and induction, and the brief but pointed account of the fall recorded in the book of Genesis, there is one passage of St. Paul's epistles (Rom. v. 12, &c.), in which the origin of evil is referred back in express terms to Adam's transgression, and the prevalence and universality of sin are accounted for upon the principle of an hereditary infection. Man is there considered as lying under a sentence of condemnation, and tainted with moral evil, in consequence of the guilt of our first parent. The apostle speaks of this doctrine as an acknowledged truth, and infers, in the way of analogy, the universality of our recovery and redemption in Christ, from the universality of our fall and condemnation in Adam, as a principle which he might safely assume for a medium of comparison and illustration; but he does not tell us what is the precise nature of that condemnation which has been brought upon us by the fall, independently of our own personal sins, nor does he attempt to define the extent and virulence of that infection of nature which has been entailed upon us by descent and derivation." (Page 177.)...

"Man, indeed, since the fall, is 'very far gone from original righteousness,' and has contracted a strong bias to evil in his will and affection, and a visible tendency to decay both in intellect and morals. But the most degenerate condition of the most ignorant and most profligate of his kind is not his natural state, nor the immediate and universal consequence of the fall. In the midst of his debasement and inherent bias to evil, he inherits many relics of his better self, principles of moral goodness, and distinct lineaments of that image of God in which he was created; and whatever his practice may be, the judgments of his understanding, and the decisions of his conscience, are usually on the side of virtue and morality, unless his intellect has been degraded by ignorance and bad education, or his conscience seared by habits of profligacy and an universal corruption of manners." (Page 184.)...

"Scripture, however," gentlemen, "speaks of the rejection of the gospel, not as the consequence of our hereditary impotence and depravity of our common nature, but as the personal sin of the unbeliever; not merely as the effect of that spiritual blindness which is derived to him from Adam, and, as is contended, can only be removed by a radical change of the intellectual faculties, but of a wilful indisposition to receive the truth and surrender himself to sufficient evidences. When our Saviour commanded his apostles to preach the gospel to all nations, he did not add that he who is born again shall believe, and he who *believeth and is baptized* shall be saved; but only, that 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved:' implying, certainly, upon common principles of interpretation, that every one to whom the gospel is preached may, if he will, believe and be saved. He does not say that he who is not regenerated will not believe, and will be damned, but simply that 'he that believeth not shall be damned:' implying that unbelief is an act of personal default, and voluntary opposition to God's testimony and spirit." (Page 203.)...

"It is not," gentlemen, "the natural effect of sin, to wipe out at once all good from the soul, and to reduce the sinner and all his posterity from a state of purity and uprightness to a state of total corruption and unmixed depravity, of antipathy to God, and enmity to the principle of holiness. If, then, such a change as this did really take place at the fall, it must have been effected by an act of omnipotence; for nothing less than an act of almighty power could have produced at once such an universal revolution in all the faculties of the soul, and swept away from it every good principle, and every lineament of its resemblance to God. But if God by an act of sovereignty converted all the children of Adam into a race of such corrupt and degraded beings, and rendered them incapable of any good whatever till they are regenerated by a similar act of omnipotence, it would seem that God is, by plain consequence, the principal cause of all wickedness, and that man, on grounds of common sense and natural equity, is no more responsible for his sins than a wild beast is responsible for that instinct of nature which we sometimes call cruelty or ferocity." (Page 205.)...

"The sum of what it (the doctrine of regeneration in baptism) teaches us is, that the forgiveness of sins purchased for us by the death of the Son of God, the gift or earnest of the Holy Ghost which he has promised to us, and a conditional title to eternal life, issuing from

his merits, and from the free grace of God, are made over in baptism to infants and adults duly qualified, without any distinction or respect of persons; and that baptism is, according to the plain lesson of scripture, the ordinary instrument of regeneration.

"In this theory, therefore, those remedies for sin and sinfulness which the gospel of Christ proffers to mankind, are contemplated as made over to us individually, through the medium of an outward sign, and certified to our faith in a simple and affecting ceremony, and in a way excellently calculated to enhance the mercy and free grace of God, and to minister to our comfort and improvement. It does not presume to inform us in what way, or to what extent, the Holy Spirit acts upon the soul in baptism, nor how he stamps and seals us as God's property; but it looks upon our regeneration as an entrance into a state of christian life, which is a life of trial and education, and therefore considers that change of disposition and habits, and that complete renewal of the soul, which some divines speak of as the very essence of the new birth, as its legitimate and intended, but not as its necessary consequence. Man is brought into a state of salvation and a covenant of repentance in baptism, but his final salvation depends on the issue of a state of trial. But if the satisfaction of Christ appears to salve the honour of God's laws, and composes and relieves the sinner's conscience, and if the promise of the Holy Ghost is a comfort and encouragement to weak and sinful creatures, we may reasonably believe (and we are firmly persuaded that scripture affords ample grounds for this article of belief) that our interest in these blessings is made over to us at some definite point of time, and through the medium of a sensible action, to which we can refer back with an assurance of faith, without being left in a state of doubt and suspense, or being tempted to have recourse to fallible and uncertain criterions." (Pages 221, 222.)...

"The scriptures teach us that no man is released from his sins and reconciled to God till he is grafted into Christ; and, consequently, that no acts can be considered as christian acts, or acts of covenanted holiness, till this change of spiritual condition has taken place. But our church very properly concludes from the same scriptures that this change takes place in baptism; that a 'death to sin, and a new birth to righteousness,' is the inward and spiritual grace of this sacrament; and that we who are by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, are hereby made children of grace; or, in

other words, 'members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.'" (Page 197.)...

Gentlemen, our ecclesiastical establishment "is bound up with our whole system of politics and religion; it is interwoven with all our history and all our institutions, with all our laws and all our usages, with all our associations and all our habits. It comes to us by descent; we inherit it as a portion of our national patrimony; it belongs to our past, as to our present; its roots have mingled themselves for ages with the roots of popular opinion, and local management, and territorial distribution. It is a matter at once of feeling and of property, linked at once with the memory of our ancestors, and the pecuniary rights and interests of the existing generation. Among *us*, nothing would be stable if our ecclesiastical establishment were broken away. It has grown with the growth and strengthened with the strength of our monarchical constitution; and that monarchical constitution would be shattered by its decay, and a mighty and simultaneous shock would convulse almost every political and every religious impression which makes our public security, or our domestic happiness, or our individual hope. It has so familiar a sympathy, so close an affinity, with the general frame and with each separate member of our social body, that it could not be destroyed without an universal derangement. Whence it manifestly follows, that whatever be the abstract good of an established church, its necessity is enhanced a thousand-fold under the actual circumstances of the British Empire. If indeed it could be proved that any other system is a more efficient instrument in training human beings for heaven, and winning souls for Christ, our cause is gone."—*(British Critic, No. 35, page 229.)*

Gentlemen, "as the evidence from history (see Appendix to Dissertations on Christian Baptism, by the late Rev. Micaiah Towgood,) enters so essentially into the merits of the question between pedobaptists and anti-pedobaptists," I shall detain you while I read "the statement of the learned Dr. Osgood."

"'We,' says he, 'acknowledge, indeed, that during the ages of darkness which preceded the protestant reformation, the institution as well as the doctrines of Christ were exceedingly corrupted, by the mixture of human inventions. We learn from history the origin of these corruptions, and that in each successive age there were witnesses against them, whose testimony shows that they never were, even at the season of the thickest darkness, universally received. I shall now prove that infant baptism stands not on the

foot of these corruptions, was not introduced on them, and, during the course of many revolving ages, was not scrupled by a single Christian. Of the writings of the primitive fathers, the immediate successors of the apostles, some scattered fragments only have reached modern times; yet in these fragments we have unquestionable evidence that infant baptism was the general practice in the very century after the apostles. They had been dead about forty years when *Justin Martyr* published his Apology, in which he mentions some 'aged Christians, who were made disciples in or from their infancy.' This is understood as implying that they were baptized, as that was the known method of making visible disciples. *Ireneus*, who was born before the death of St. John, is yet more full in his testimony. *Origen* was born about one hundred years after the decease of the apostles, and from him we have these words: 'The church received a tradition or order from the apostles, to administer baptism to infants.' About fifty years after this, or one hundred and fifty from the apostles, baptism being then universally considered as supplying the place of circumcision, a question arose whether it ought not, as circumcision was, to be deferred till the eighth day after the birth of the child. For the discussion of this question, a council of sixty-six bishops, or pastors of churches, was assembled at *Carthage*. In their result they gave it as their opinion, that 'baptism ought least of all to be referred to a new-born infant;' and, as to its being put off to the eighth day, they add, 'there is not one that approves of it; it appears to us all, who are here met in council, far otherwise.' Undoubtedly some of the elders upon this council could remember what the practice of the church had been for seventy or eighty years before, at which period there were probably many living who were born within the age of the apostles, and who must have known what their practice had been. If the baptizing of infants had not originated with the apostles, is it credible that all the churches of Christendom should have so soon and so universally departed from the apostolic institution? If so striking and notorious an innovation had been attempted, is it not beyond all belief that it should have been everywhere received, without a single objection from any of those myriads of saints, confessors, and martyrs, who lived in the purest and best ages of the church?'...

"The learned *Dr. Wall*, who inquired most accurately into this subject, says, 'For the first four hundred years, there appears only

one man, Tertullian, that advised the *delay* of infant baptism in some cases; and one, Gregory, that did, perhaps, practise such delay, in the case of his own children; but no society, so thinking, or so practising, nor any one man saying that it was unlawful to baptize infants. In the next seven hundred years, there is not so much as one man to be found that either *spoke for* or practised any such *delay*, but all the contrary. And when, about the year 1130, one sect among the Waldenses declared against the baptizing of infants as being incapable of salvation, the main body of that people rejected their opinion; and those of them that held that opinion quickly dwindled away and disappeared, there being no more heard of who held that tenet, until the rising of the German Anti-pedobaptists in the year 1522.' This account by *Dr. Wall* brings us down to the era of the Protestant Reformation. Amidst the commotions attendant upon that great revolution, sprang up the founders of the present sect of Anabaptists. Soon after *Luther's* appearance, says Dr. Robertson, in his history of Charles V., 'the rashness or ignorance of some of his disciples led them to publish tenets no less absurd than pernicious, which, being proposed to men extremely illiterate, but fond of novelty, and at a time when their minds were turned wholly towards religious speculations, gained too easy credit and authority among them. The most remarkable of their religious tenets related to the sacrament of baptism, which, as they contended, ought to be administered only to persons grown up to years of understanding, and should be performed, not by sprinkling them with water, but by dipping them in it. For this reason they condemned the baptism of infants, and, rebaptizing all whom they admitted into their society, the sect came to be distinguished by the name of Anabaptists. To this peculiar notion concerning baptism, they added other principles of a most enthusiastic as well as dangerous nature. By a monstrous, and almost incredible conjunction, voluptuousness was ingrafted on religion, and dissolute riot accompanied the austerities of fanatical devotion. Luther, who had testified against this fanatical spirit on its first appearance, now deeply lamented its progress, and exposed the delusion with great strength of argument, as well as acrimony of style.' Not *Luther* only, but *Calvin*, *Melancthon*, *Bullinger*, *Zuinglius*, *Gualter*, *Sleidan*, *Zanchy*, and indeed all the eminent reformers, united their voice in bearing solemn testimony against the principles of this sect, reprobating them in terms of great severity. ...

"Having found their way into England, some of them very early appeared in America, formed a society at *Swansey*, and another at Boston, in the year 1665. Of this last Dr. Mather relates, 'that they admitted into their society persons whom our churches excommunicated for moral scandal, and employed them as administrators of the two sacraments.' From such an origin, and such beginnings, has this sect arisen. If there be any truth in history, their opinions are wholly modern, and unknown to antiquity. If infant baptism be a human invention, and an absolute nullity, as they pretend, it is certain that, three centuries ago, there was not a society of baptized christians in the world, nor had been for many preceding ages. What, then, are we to conclude? Did the church of Christ remain, during the lapse of centuries, overpowered by the *gates of hell?* If we could suppose this, yet would it not be more difficult still to suppose, that it was at length recovered by the madmen of Munster, the German Anabaptists?"...

These things are not mentioned "with the most distant idea to degrade the Baptist denomination, amongst whom are, doubtless, many respectable characters, who view the turbulence and enthusiasm of the German Baptists with the greatest detestation; but merely to show that their views of baptism are not so ancient and apostolic as many are prone to imagine and zealous to propagate."...

..."Though the scriptures be, at last, our only sure guide, yet it is a satisfaction to know in what sense our fellow-christians understand the scriptures with reference to any disputed point, and how they have been understood by the church of Christ in former ages; and if we be able, as in this question concerning infant baptism, to trace the practice of it up through all preceding ages to that of the apostles, it must be allowed a strong presumptive argument in favour of its having originated with the apostles themselves." (Pages 134—140.)

My clients, gentlemen, are not all of one creed, although they are agreed on first principles. All of them christen infants; yet some make the qualification for the rite to depend on the infant being born of believing parents; and, where sponsors are dispensed with, I am informed that it is understood, or implied, that the parents take upon themselves the responsibility. Again, those who object to the requirements of the colleges, send their youth to academies of their own; yet, although there is this difference among my clients, they denominate each other brethren, and are unanimous

in their endeavours to explode what they deem the errors of the defendants. Indeed those of them who dissent from the church are by far the most zealous in our cause.

It is not, gentlemen, because my clients feel any doubt of the justice of their claim that they now appear before you; they seek by your verdict a confirmation of it, rather with a view to open the eyes of their misguided opponents, and induce them to retrace their steps, and return into the bosom of the church, or other orthodox denominations, any of which, I hesitate not to say, would receive them with open arms. Now, gentlemen, can you conceive of anything more liberal, more disinterested, or more charitable, than this,—the more especially when you take into consideration that my clients are the most numerous, the most intelligent, the most learned, and the most influential party? Indeed, I might say we are almost the only party. Our opponents, when compared to the inhabitants of Christendom, are little more than "as the small dust of the balance."

It may naturally be asked, then, seeing our oponents are so very few as to be scarcely worthy of notice, Why agitate the question—why bring the cause into court? For this reason: though very few, they are very troublesome; the general disturbers of our peace and quiet. We are contented with the creeds handed down to us by our forefathers, who we think were wiser in their generatiou than their offspring. I am free to confess that there are some things in them which do not exactly meet our views; yet as we are now by habit become reconciled to them, we are averse to any change, it being obvious that the result of a change would be nothing but confusion and inconvenience. If our opponents would enjoy their own opinions, without intruding them upon us, we should not interfere with them;—but they are always on the watch, ready to controvert any statement we advance, and thus their doctrines obtain publicity, and frequently induce in the breasts of some of my weak and hypochondriacal clients such an enquiry as the following: "Ah! if I should not be right, what will become of me?" Now we trust, gentlemen, that your verdict in our favour will allay such misgivings—will prevent for the future such a heart-rending inquiry, and incline the hearts of all people to worship together in unity.

Gentlemen, the true intent of the clauses beforementioned is what we principally wish your verdict to determine. But the whole of the Will is of such vast importance, that, as we proceed, other

clauses affecting the legatees will come under your consideration. The Will has been so generally published in this kingdom, that whoever will may obtain an insight into its provisions. It has been asked by some of my clients, whether it be wise to allow the illiterate to form their own opinion of them; and whether it would not be better that they should receive instruction only through the medium of the men who have been set apart for that purpose. They argue that it is incredible to suppose that the unlearned can understand matters which few of the most learned have yet been able fully to comprehend. We ourselves, gentlemen, as you have already heard, do not rely entirely on our own views of the Will, but call to our aid the views taken of it by certain notable characters who immediately succeeded the apostles, fragments of whose writings have been carefully handed down to us. And do we not, gentlemen, in this, manifest our wisdom, as well as our humility? for surely this method is much more likely to conduce to a correct judgment than pursuing the opposite course — that of rejecting all tradition, seeing that the Will has heen published nearly eighteen hundred years.

In the course of the trial, gentlemen, my witnesses will point out several little words, apparently of trifling importance, but which they have found to be far otherwise. By giving these words a construction different from that which they now bear in the text, and to which they are naturally convertible, several passages, closely connected with the clauses in question, obtain a meaning very different from that which is generally put upon them by the unlearned. My witnesses will also be able to satisfy you that the word baptize, even, upon which so much depends, has no precise and definite meaning, so far as it respects the manner of introducing converts into the church — that the sense of it cannot be determined by the Will. With this acknowledged ambiguity of the Will, then, the only way by which we can arrive at the knowledge of its true signification is by an appeal to antiquity, by showing how it was understood and acted upon in the age immediately succeeding that of the apostles. This, gentlemen, I have in part already shown, and am happy to say shall be prepared still further to show. Besides, gentlemen, we have for our guidance the striking facts, that, for nearly four thousand years, the Jewish infants were, by the command of the Most High, circumcised, and thus brought into covenant with him, and that all who were proselyted to the Jewish

religion, with all their male children, were also commanded to be circumcised. Now it is manifest, from ancient tradition, that the Jews, besides circumcising these proselytes, either dipped, washed, sprinkled, or affused them, the application of the water in the performance of all these different rites being, according to the opinions held by learned men, expressed by the one word baptize. But it appears that the Testator, on his coming into the world, abrogated the rite of circumcision, and retained the use of water, which the Jews had previously established, — "thus graciously accommodating the laws and institutions of the new kingdom which he came to establish, to the predilections of the people among whom he came," well aware, from their known obstinacy, that if he had attempted to establish any new order of things, he would not have succeeded. Hence many theologians denominate baptism a borrowed rite, and say, that as the Testator took up and continued an observance which the Jews had established, so, in like manner, they may attach such meaning to the word baptize as may best suit the prevailing customs and tastes of different nations, and thus reconcile all men to it.

Gentlemen, you have been specially summoned to decide, in an impartial manner, between us and our opponents. I have submitted to you that we have not only the great body of the people on our side, but that we have custom and precedent also, by which cases in this country are generally determined; and I am proud to inform you that we have in attendance, as witnesses, not only the most popular of our divines, but one of the most popular of a sister nation, men of learning and zeal, who have stood forward, as it were, in the forefront of the battle, in defence of this mighty cause. These will bring before you such a mass of evidence, direct or circumstantial, as, I am persuaded, will satisfy you of the justice of our claim, and induce you, by your verdict, to set the question at rest for ever.

One word, gentlemen, in conclusion, and I sit down. The more you hear of this invaluable Will, the more you will be convinced of the vast importance of looking narrowly into the nature of its bequests. I understand that our opponents are, in their own opinion, prepared with sufficient evidence, not only to invalidate our claim, but to establish their own. Melancholy, indeed, would our case be, if such a thing were within the range of possibility; for, should they succeed, the majority of the people of Christendom would be found, indeed, in a hopeless state.

Gentlemen, I thank you for the attention with which you have listened to my address. I deem it unnecessary to take up more of your time now, or to address you again, being confident that the evidence I shall produce will be of so convincing a character, as to throw my humble abilities into the shade, and to insure for us your verdict — a verdict that will settle the question — that there are no "more efficient instruments in training human beings for heaven, and bringing souls to Christ," than our venerable Ecclesiastical Establishment, and the various Pedobaptist Institutions.

EVIDENCE OF THE WITNESSES.

At the conclusion of his address, the Counsel for the Plaintiffs proceeded to call his Witnesses, who gave their evidence on the institution of Baptism—on the meaning of the words Βαπτω and Βαπτιζω—and on the mode or manner of administering the ordinance.

The First Witness said,—I cannot appear before this honourable court "without a measure of anxiety, for, though perfectly satisfied with the *purity* of my *motives*, and *simplicity* of my *intention*," I am far from anticipating that the evidence I am about to give will afford me pleasure. The" court "will, no doubt, find many things *defective*, and, perhaps, some *incorrect*.... My" endeavour to be as *concise* as possible "will, no doubt, in several cases produce obscurity. Whatever errors may be observed must be attributed to my scantiness of knowledge, when compared with the learning and information necessary for the tolerable perfection of" a testimony on such a momentous cause.

"I think it best to bring everything as much as possible within the reach of... comparatively simple people, or those whose avocations prevent them from entering deeply into subjects of this kind,"... and, in giving my evidence, I shall "thus study rather to be *useful*, than appear to be learned." I have no other pretensions in coming before you, than that the testimony I shall give may be "*as a help to a better understanding of the sacred writings.*"... If there be but a few spots, such as may be fairly attributed to human frailty,... the" candour of the court "will pass them by, in favour of the general principle; and I trust it will not be thought irrelevant, if I state, in a few words, the manner in which I have investigated the sacred writings." (See the advertisement at the beginning of his Bible.)...

"My education, and habits from early youth, led me to read and study the Bible, not as a text-book to confirm the articles of a *preconceived creed*, but as a revelation from God to man.... Conscious that translators in general must have had a particular creed, in reference to which they would naturally consider every text; and this reference, however honestly intended, might lead them to

glosses not always fairly deducible from the original words," I come before you to give my evidence "with a heart as free from bias and sectarian feeling as possible." (End of his Bible, page 14.)

"Those who have compared most of the European translations with the original have not scrupled to say that the *English translation of the Bible, made under the direction of King James the first, is the most accurate and faithful of the whole.* Nor is this its only praise; the translators have seized the very *spirit* and *soul* of the original, and expressed this almost everywhere with pathos and energy. Besides, our translators have not only made a *standard translation*, but they have made their translation the *standard of our language.* The English tongue in their day was not equal to such a work, but God enabled them to stand as upon Mount Sinai, to use the expression of a learned friend, 'and crane up their country's language to the dignity of the originals,' so that after the lapse of two hundred years the English Bible is, with very few exceptions, the standard of the purity and excellence of the English tongue. The original from which it was taken is alone superior to the Bible translated by the authority of King James. This is an opinion in which my heart, my judgment, and my conscience coincide." (General Preface to the Bible, page 21.)

"In what form baptism was originally administered has been deemed a subject worthy of serious dispute: were the people *dipped*, or *sprinkled?* (for it is certain that Βαπτω and Βαπτιζω mean both.) They were all dipped, say some. Can any man suppose that it was possible for John to dip 'all the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judea, and of all the country round about the Jordan?' Were both men and women dipped? for certainly both came to his baptism. This could never have comported either with safety or with decency. Were they dipped in their clothes? — this would have endangered their lives, if they had not with them change of raiment; and as such a baptism as John's (however administered,) was in several respects a new thing in Judea, it is not at all likely that the people would come thus provided. But suppose these were dipped, which I think it would be impossible to prove, does it follow that in all the regions of the world men and women must *be dipped*, in order to be evangelically baptized? In the eastern countries *bathings* were frequent, because of the heat of the climate, it being there so necessary to cleanliness and health; but would our climate, or a more northerly one, admit

of this with safety for at least three-fourths of the year? We may rest assured that it could not; and may we not presume, that if John had opened his commission in the north of Great Britain, for many months of the year, he would have dipped neither man nor woman, unless he could have procured a tepid bath? Those who are *dipped* or *immersed* in water, in the name of the Holy Trinity, I believe to be evangelically baptized. Those who are washed or sprinkled with water, in the same name of the Father, Son, and of the Holy Ghost, I believe to be equally so." (See his Commentary on Matt. iii. 6.)

Here I would "earnestly recommend" to the notice of the court... "the observations made by Dr. Lightfoot, who hath spoken well on the subject.... 'Both dipping and sprinkling are legitimate forms, and either may be used, as the consciences or religious prejudices of the parties may direct....

"'That the baptism of John was by plunging the body...seems to appear from those things which are related of him, viz. — that he baptized *in Jordan* — that he baptized in Ænon, *because there was much water there* — and that Christ, being baptized, *came up out of the water;* to which that seems to be parallel, (Acts viii. 38,) *Philip and the eunuch went down into the water, &c.* Some complain that this rite is not retained in the Christian church, as though it something derogated from the truth of baptism, or as though it were to be called an innovation, when the sprinkling of water is used instead of plunging.

"'That the notion of washing in John's baptism differs from ours, in that he baptized none who were not brought over from one religion, and that an irreligious one too, into another, and that a true one. But there is no place for this among us, who are born christians; the condition therefore being varied, the rite is not only lawfully, but deservedly varied also. Our baptism argues defilement indeed,... but this is to be understood of our natural and sinful stain, to be washed away by the blood of Christ and the grace of God; with which stain, indeed, they were defiled who were baptized by John. But to denote this washing by a sacramental sign, the sprinkling of water is as sufficient as the dipping into water, when, in truth, this argues washing and purification as well as that.

"'Since dipping was a rite used only in the Jewish nation, and proper to it, it were something hard if all nations should be subjected under it; but especially when it is neither necessary to be

esteemed as the essence of baptism, and is, moreover, so harsh and dangerous, that in regard to these things it scarcely gave place to circumcision.

"'We suppose, therefore, that men, women, and children came to John's baptism, according to the manner of the nation in the reception of proselytes, namely, that they, standing in Jordan, were taught by John, that they were baptized into the name of the Messias, who was now immediately to come, and into the profession of the doctrine of the gospel concerning faith and repentance, that they *plunged themselves* into the river, and so came out.'" (The end of Mark.)

The SECOND WITNESS said,—"As religion did always consist in an imitation of God... so we may imitate him now with much more ease and greater advantage, since his Son was manifested in the flesh and dwelt among us; for he was pleased to become man, on purpose to show us how we might become like to God, by daily imitation of his holiness. ... This consideration has induced me to set before" this court "the example of the holy Jesus, ... that so, following our Lord and Master in all the steps of an imitable virtue, and setting his example continually before us, we may be daily correcting and reforming our lives by that glorious pattern; for, without present likeness to him, we have no grounds to hope that we shall hereafter live with him. ... I heartily wish the duty" of appearing before it "had fallen upon the shoulders of some that had more leisure and greater abilities" to speak in behalf of the plaintiffs, whose cause it is my "highest ambition to serve." (Address to Family Governors.)

"We do not deny the lawfulness of baptizing by immersion, but we cannot assert the absolute and indispensable necessity of it. (See his Testament, page 424.)...We do not oppose the lawfulness of dipping in some cases, but the necessity of dipping in all cases. In sacraments, it is not the quantity of the elements, but the significancy of them, that ought to be attended to: as in circumcision, it was not the quantity of the flesh cut off; and in the Lord's Supper, it is not the quantity of the bread and wine taken down; so in baptism, a few drops of water poured upon me doth signify and seal, and convey and confirm to me, a right and interest in all the benefits of my Saviour's death and resurrection, as fully, as if, with Jonah, I were plunged into the main ocean." (Page 395.)

The THIRD WITNESS said, — "In deference to" the "judgment, and in compliance with" the "request of the president, members, and secretary of the Salop District Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge," I present myself before this court, to give my testimony "in a form adapted for the community at large."... (Title Page and Dedication.)

"Upon the introduction of the new covenant in Christ, God was pleased to institute a new ceremony, whereby mankind at large were to be admitted into covenant with him, as the Jews had been by the rite of circumcision. For this purpose, Christ adopted baptism, which had been consecrated by his brethren after the flesh to a similar use, and ordained it as the rite by which those that believed in him should be admitted to the privileges of his religion." (Page 6.)...

"It was to this sacrament of baptism, the institution of which he was anticipating, that our Saviour alluded, when he declared to the Jewish Rabbi, who was enquiring into the nature of his doctrine, 'Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.'" (Page 7.)..."It should appear, I say, that he was here alluding by anticipation to the sacrament of baptism, which he intended to ordain, and to that supernatural grace which was thereby to be conferred, through the instrumentality of water, and by the agency of the Holy Ghost." (Page 8.)...

"But there must be something done on our parts in order to it, and something that is instituted and ordained by Christ himself, which in the Old Testament was circumcision, in the New, baptism, or washing with water, the easiest that could be invented, and the most proper to signify his cleansing and regenerating us by the Holy Spirit." (Page 26.)...

"We are washed with water, and then the words are added, For we are baptized in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, whereby the baptism receiveth its strength. Now this sacrament of baptism is a thing of great weight, for it ascertaineth and assureth us that like as the water washeth the body, and cleanseth it, so the blood of Christ our Saviour cleanseth and washeth it from all filth and uncleanness of sins.... And although we acknowledge, with humble and grateful hearts, that the continued and unceasing influence of the Spirit is requisite for the welfare of our souls, and that we are daily renewed by his sanctifying power, sometimes perhaps without the instrumentality of outward means, still we are justified in contending, that for the express purpose of

regeneration, not only is his operation necessary, but that it must also (humanly speaking) be administered through the mediation of water. It is not for man to dispense with the ordinances of God." (Page 27.)

The Fourth Witness said, "I am a minister of the establishment; and as I saw no sufficient reason to relinquish my station, I was satisfied that it was my duty to retain it. (His Life, page 164.)...With a heart full of pride and wickedness, my life polluted with many unrepented, unforsaken sins, without one cry for mercy, one prayer for direction or assistance, or for a blessing upon what I was about to do; after having concealed my real sentiments under the mask of general expressions, after having subscribed articles directly contrary to what I believed, and after having blasphemously declared, in the presence of God and the congregation, in the most solemn manner, sealing it with the Lord's supper, that I judged myself to be 'inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take that office upon me,' not knowing or believing that there was any Holy Ghost; I was ordained a Deacon." (Page 41.)... "'The Force of Truth' (a publication by this witness,) sufficiently explains the state of my heart and my conduct, as it must have appeared in the sight of God, in this most solemn concern of my ordination; and it suffices here to say that, considered in all respects, I deliberately judge this whole transaction to have been the most atrocious wickedness of my life. But I did not at the time in any degree regard it in this light, nor did I till long after feel any remorse of conscience for *my prevaricating*, if not directly *lying*, subscriptions and declarations, and all the evil of my motives and actions in the whole concern." (Page 38.)...

But "I have discovered the importance of that trust which is committed to me—what is the extent of that duty it requires, and how it ought to be performed; and I find it something inconceivably different from what one would suppose it to be, from the too general, and well nigh universal, conduct of those to whom it is committed. I have also discovered what true and unadulterated christianity is; and find it not exactly what even *our* creeds and articles represent it. I have arrived, in point of conscience, at perhaps an unnecessary scrupulousness, insomuch that I cannot, either through hopes of gain and favour, or through fear of loss and censure, do a thing that my heart disapproves....If by subscription be meant an avowed assent to

the truth of every proposition contained in what we subscribe, I can never subscribe these Articles (the Thirty-nine), without telling a most audacious lie, in the face of God, in a solemn and important matter of religion, for the sake of sordid lucre; such a lie would wound my conscience, and forfeit his favor, *in whose favor is life*, and riches would make me but a poor amends.... But should preferment be offered, I shall venture to ask whether" what I have just said "be the right definition of subscription or not. If they mean anything else, and will say so,—I mean that a man may subscribe without believing every part,—I then could subscribe. It is true subscription would be then a farce, but that is their business." (Pages 87, 88.)...

"Indeed I am ready to tremble at the awful responsibility to which I have subjected myself, when I write upon this testimony of Christ, and think of the work in which I have been during so many years engaged. But the merciful Saviour will no more condemn unintentional mistakes in the honest *writer*, who desires to help men to understand his word, and proceeds in simple, humble dependence on his teaching, than he will the honest *preacher:* and I trust this effort to explain his Holy Scriptures, though feeble and defective, has been conducted from proper motives, and in dependence on the Lord. I can confidently appeal to my heart-searching Judge that I have, as far I know, written word for word what I supposed he would have me write, without adding, altering, or keeping back the sense of any passage willingly, to serve any personal end or party interest, from fear of incurring reproach or opposition, or desire of conciliating the favour of any man or set of men whatever; and that the mistakes which have been made were involuntary, the effects of ignorance and error, and not of design." (End of his Commentary on the Revelation.)

"To the question of immersion, or sprinkling, or pouring, I never attached any great importance. Immersion is, doubtless, baptism, and so is sprinkling, or pouring, according to my unvaried judgment. If a few texts seem to allude to baptism by figures taken from immersion, how many speak of the *baptism of the Holy Spirit* under the idea of pouring out upon us? The investigation of this controversy brought a variety of other subjects under my consideration, of which I had not before at all thought. I met with many objections to the established church, which I was not competent to

answer, except by reciprocal objections to many things in use among our opponents, which I thought at least equally unscriptural." (Page 166.)...

"It is highly reasonable to believe the Bible to be a divine revelation, and if so, then equally reasonable to take all our measures of truth and duty from it, and to bow our understandings and inclinations to its teaching and governance." (Preface to his Bible, page 2.)...

"The law of Moses prescribes 'divers washings,' or baptisms, in which water was used in different ways;... by degrees it became customary in the Jewish church to baptize those who were proselyted to their religion from the Gentiles, both male and female, as well as to circumcise the males.... But, though baptism had been before in use, John was singular in baptizing all his disciples, notwithstanding they had before been Jews, and without distinction of previous character; thus intimating, that by nature and practice they were all polluted, and could not be admitted among the true people of God, except washed from their sins in the fountain which the Messiah was about to open.... Water was the outward sign, but whether the rite was administered by immersion or not is incapable of decisive proof. The use of water is essential, because that is the universal purifier; the quantity, and mode of application, seem to be merely circumstances, varying as occasion may require.... Βαπτιζω is derived from Βαπτω, to dip or immerse, (Luke xvi. 24; John xiii. 26; Rev. xix. 13,) but it is not synonymous with it, as the use of the word and its derivatives clearly shows. (Matt. xx. 22, 23; Mark vii. 4, x. 38, 39; Luke iii. 16, xi. 38, xii. 50; Acts i. 5; Heb. ix. 10.) It is taken more largely for any kind of washing, rinsing, or cleansing, even where there is no dipping at all....Some, indeed, contend zealously that baptism always signifies *immersion;* but the use of the words *baptize* and *baptism* in the New Testament cannot accord with this exclusive interpretation. On the other hand, some, arguing perhaps too much from modern habits, have been sufficiently decided for the opposite interpretation. But" I, "after many years' consideration and study," having already given the outline of my "own conclusions, would only add that vastly too much eagerness and acrimony have been employed in disputes on the subject, and far too little attention to the instruction suggested by this ordinance." (See his Testament, Matt. iii. 5, 6.)

The FIFTH WITNESS said—I am an instructor of youth, and a preacher of the gospel...." In studying the scriptures as a theological employment...I have found no small difficulty in permitting them to speak for themselves. I found texts in them, in various instances, thwarting opinions which I had entertained with little or no suspicion that they could be erroneous. Such opinions, by an authority which I durst not oppose, I have been compelled to give up; whether I have adopted better in their place is yet to be determined. One consideration furnishes me with a satisfactory hope that what I have taught is substantially at least the truth of God. It is this; the system contained in" my " discourses is in substance the same with that which is found in almost every Protestant creed and confession of faith, and with the scheme adopted in every age by that part of the christian church which has gained everywhere the appropriate name of orthodox." (See his Sermons, vol. 2, page 644.)...

" I shall now attempt to show what baptism is, considered as an external religious rite; or, in other words, in what manner baptism is to be administered....Baptism is to be administered with water only....This water may be administered indifferently, either by sprinkling, affusion, or immersion. On this subject the christian world has for a considerable length of time been disturbed by the clashing opinions and laborious contests of men, arranged on the two sides of the question concerning baptism. It is remarkable, that those who have adopted the doctrine of infant baptism have very generally considered *sprinkling* or *affusion*, and that those who have opposed it have considered *immersion*, respectively, as the proper modes of administration. Why this has happened I am unable to explain. The latter of these classes have founded their opinion professedly on the proper meaning of the word Βαπτιζω, and its root Βαπτω, and on certain texts in which they think they find proofs that the proper mode of baptizing was immersion or plunging."

" Concerning the former of these subjects, I observe, 1. That the body of learned critics and lexicographers declare that the original meaning of both these words is to *tinge*, *stain*, *dye*, or *colour;* and that when it means immersion, it is only in a secondary and occasional sense, derived from the fact that such things as are dyed, stained, or coloured, are often immersed for this end. This interpretation of the words, also, they support by such a series of

quotations as seem unanswerably to evince that this was the original classical meaning of these words.

2. "I have examined almost a hundred instances in which the word Βαπτιζω and its derivatives are used in the New Testament, and four in the Septuagint: these, so far as I have observed, being all the instances contained in both. By this examination, it is to my apprehension evident that the following things are true:—

"That the primary meaning of these terms is cleansing: the effect, and not the mode, of washing....That these words, although often capable of denoting any mode of washing, whether by affusion, sprinkling, or immersion, since cleansing was familiarly accomplished by the Jews in all these ways, yet in many instances cannot, without obvious impropriety, be made to signify immersion, and in others cannot signify it at all." (Vol. 2, pages 541, 542.)

"To these observations may be added, the unsuitableness of immersion, as an ordinance of public worship, to the circumstances of many nations in the world.

"In a nation whose manners are like ours, (the inhabitants of the United States,) there is, to say the least, a degree of impropriety in this practice which is very unhappy. This, it will be easily seen, is a subject on which I cannot here expatiate. It will be sufficient to say, that whatever impressions may be made by this practice in countries where bathing is a standing custom, here they are of a very unfortunate nature, and such as are directly opposed to every religious feeling. I speak from facts, and not from opinions; and from facts repeated through a century, and therefore operating, not by their novelty, but by their nature.

"At the same time, the health and the lives of those who are baptized are often injured and destroyed. Here also I speak from facts. Both these considerations form, I acknowledge, only a presumptive argument in the present case: for God has an unquestionable right to require us to undergo this exposure, or any other, according to his good pleasure. But the presumption is a very strong one, and to be admitted in its full force, unless the practice contended for is expressed with indubitable clearness." (Vol. 2, page 546.)

The Sixth Witness said—I shall "endeavour to adhere to the Latin maxim, familiarly rendered in English, 'Soft words and hard arguments.' Whether I" shall "succeed or fail, the" court

" must judge."...To the blessing of the Lord I humbly commend the evidence that I am about to give, " in the conviction,—a conviction that has gained strength by every new examination of the subject,—that the cause is his, and that its opponents, however plausible their scheme may be rendered, (and it is admitted in some of its points to be susceptible of *great* plausibility,) have not a foot-breadth of solid scriptural ground to stand upon." (Preface to his Dissertation, pages 11, 12.)

I shall endeavour " to show, from the plain statements of the New Testament itself, that baptism was performed by sprinkling or pouring, and that there is no necessity for any learned appeal to other authorities. This appeal has been made by pædobaptists, and made in my judgment with success. They do not deny that the verbs Βαπτω and Βαπτιζω signify to *dip* or *immerse;* but they do deny that this is their only signification, and that it is their signification when they are used by the sacred writers." (His Dissertation, page 176.)...

" Being myself thoroughly convinced that the significance and appropriateness of the rite arise from the cleansing nature of the element employed, and not from the mode of its application, I am disposed to consider the mode as of comparatively inferior importance. It is in the application of water, as the emblem of the purifying influence of the Spirit of truth, that the ordinance properly consists. A baptist brother may smile at me when I say that, on this ground, I have no hesitation in admitting immersion to be valid baptism." (Page 162.)...

" It is, I repeat, in the *application of water as a cleansing element*, that the appropriateness of the rite consists. Were this admitted, I should not be disposed, as I have before hinted, to consider the mode of *its application* as essential to the validity of the ordinance. I must, however, declare my conviction, that," while I can produce " decisive instances of baptism in the phraseology of the New Testament being equivalent to *effusion*, I have never yet seen an instance established of its necessarily or certainly signifying *immersion*. The" court " will therefore perceive, that when I say I can admit immersion to be valid baptism, I do not mean that it has been administered according to the mode practised by the apostles. All that I mean is, that if baptism has already been administered by immersion, I should not reckon it necessary to administer it again by effusion or sprinkling." (Page 169.)

The SEVENTH WITNESS said,—"I have long felt myself particularly called upon to" give my evidence on this subject, "from the circumstance of having published some explanations, connected with it, of certain Greek prepositions, and verbs, and nouns, in my Greek Grammar, and Greek and English Scripture Lexicon." (His Essays on Baptism, page 14.)...

"Reasons may be assigned, though not to justify, yet to account for, much of the ignorance which prevails among christians respecting baptism. When they first have their attention directed to the observance of ordinances, they do not usually take much notice of baptism, which they believe they have already received, but rather of the Lord's supper, which they desire to partake of as the highest privilege of saints on earth." (Page 6.)

"I am aware that many have been long ago shouting victory in this contest. The duty of immersing in water those who are to be baptized, and of requiring that none shall be baptized till they have made a profession of faith, is alleged to be so plain an article of christian doctrine, that the man who hears the gospel and rejects that article must be wilfully disobedient. But it may well abate this confidence, and should humble us all, to see the battle continuing to rage, without the smallest appearance of termination.

"Christians are actually beginning to despair of any result from the existing controversy. Even among Protestants, whose principle it is that the Scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith and practice, several churches have been of late years formed, on an understood acknowledgment that the word of God gives no explicit instruction to his people on so rudimental a subject as the ordinance of baptism. Every member is therefore left to do respecting it that which is right in his own eyes; and it is agreed, that whatever each may think or do for himself, that ordinance shall, in no form, and in no case, be admitted into any part of their public worship." (Pages 6, 7.)...

"It unfortunately happens, that the ordinance of baptism has come into protestant churches with an uncommonly large share of the superstitions and absurdities of the church of Rome.

"Who can be surprised at the number of anti-pedobaptists in the southern part of the island, where it is the general system to baptize all children, and at the same time to exclude all parents from any part in the matter; where the whole service is a transaction between a priest and certain sureties, called godfathers and

godmothers; where the priest is made to talk as if to the child, and the sureties are made to answer in his name; where a formal bargain is struck between Christ on the one hand and the child on the other, in consideration of certain promises to be performed by each party to the other; where the priest must pray that the water to be used may be made holy; where he is directed to dip the child in the water, 'if he may well endure it,' and yet uniformly pours water upon him, not as being right, but that which shall suffice if they certify that the child is weak, and which is made to suffice whether he be weak or not; where, after baptizing, the priest makes a cross upon the child's forehead, and 'gives thanks to God for his regeneration.'" (Page 10.)

"No great hardship could be experienced in any climate, were the practice enjoined every day; and surely that would be a very extraordinary constitution which could not, at any age, 'well endure' to be plunged once in one's life." (Page 154.)...

"Many of the most flagrant of these abuses are little known in Scotland; and yet baptism is, according to the general system in this country, dispensed without due regard to the character of the parents. At the same time, it is connected with the imposition of vows on parents which are altogether unknown in scripture, but which they must either submit to or forfeit their privilege, and which it is intended the child shall take upon himself, if he ever desires to be admitted to the Lord's supper. Before baptism, prayer is, as in the other case, offered up that the water may be made holy. Baptism is described as sprinkling and washing, and again as pouring or sprinkling, which it is declared is not only lawful, but sufficient and most expedient.

"The one national church avows a preference for immersion, while she tolerates the neglect of it, and that upon the foolish supposition that a cold bath may be more than an infant can 'well endure'; refuses the privileges of christian parents, while she baptizes all children without distinction; and leaves it as a matter of dispute whether baptism and regeneration be not one and the same thing. The other national church calls baptism washing, confounds pouring and sprinkling, and recommends what it thus represents as one mode, as merely lawful, sufficient, and most expedient; all which terms admit the inference, that another mode, namely immersion, may possibly have been the original practice.

"Independents have not left this ordinance in so vague and

ambiguous a condition as Episcopalians or Presbyterians have done. In regard, however, to the disputed points, they have commonly satisfied themselves with bare self-defence. They have found little or no fault with the principles and practice of anti-pedobaptists, but have endeavoured to vindicate themselves for not following their example. They have said, (some of them at least,) that immersion was no doubt baptism, but that pouring was baptism also; that the infants of believers have a right to be baptized, and that therefore the parents are justifiable in claiming it in their favour; but some of them seem to have very little sense of their obligation to require that parents in their communion do their duty in this matter.

"The tendency of this negative and slovenly manner of treating the subject is to generate scepticism. The careless disregard the controversy as unprofitable, while the timid are frightened into the system of the anti-pedobaptists. They see all allow that immersion is right, but the other mode they find to be by some contested: all allow that anti-pedobaptists are themselves baptized, although they hold that others have no baptism, either for themselves or for their children. They prefer immersion, therefore, and join the anti-pedobaptists, on the principle of taking the safest side of a difficult question." (Pages 11—13.)...

It is inaccurate to explain "baptism to be washing. It is not washing, but a figure of washing. This is true, in whatever way it be administered." It is also inaccurate to call "baptism sprinkling. ...There is another form which is thought to belong to the ordinance of baptism, commonly called immersion. It consists in putting the subject of baptism completely under water, and then lifting him up again. This is a transaction between one man and another, which for any purpose, common or sacred, I have not been able to meet with in the Holy Scriptures."

"What, then, do I conceive to be the scriptural form of the ordinance of baptism? It is the pouring out of water from the hand of the baptizer on the turned-up face of the baptized. This I conceive to be the only scriptural mode of administering the ordinance." (Pages 17, 18.)

"I am persuaded that the word baptize has never yet been properly analysed.... For example, the word baptize has been shown to signify pouring out; but it does not appear to me to have been yet shown how it has come to have this signification. The general understanding seems to be, that immersion is its original meaning; and

although authorities are given, and examples are quoted, to prove that it must be sometimes taken in the sense of pouring out, there remains this difficulty, of conceiving how so extraordinary a transition should have taken place as that of the derivative, *pouring out*, from the primitive, *plunging in*. It is admitted, perhaps, that there is no arguing against facts; and that, therefore, there may be passages in which pouring out must be supposed to be the meaning of baptize. But still the other is thought to be the more natural interpretation; and, therefore, when other words in a passage do not compel to admit the meaning of pouring out, the meaning of immersing is preferred of course.

"This supposition is favoured by another: Βαπτιζω is derived from Βαπτω, but Βαπτω is thought always to signify immerse, or, at least, always to imply immersing in its signification. Hence, it is alleged, we ought to understand Βαπτιζω as properly implying the same idea.

"I have been led to question these suppositions. Neither Βαπτω nor Βαπτιζω signifies to immerse more than to pour out. (Pages 21, 22.)... I feel myself supported in affirming, that the term *pop* is the root of the words which we have proposed to analyse. Will the" court, "then, have the goodness to accustom" its "ear to the following sounds. *Popto*, *poptizo*, *poptistis*, *poptos*, *poptimos*, and *poptisma*. In this identical form the root occurs, in Greek, in Latin, and in English." (Page 25.)...

"Keep in mind, now, the above explanation (see the work), and apply it to baptism *(poptism)*, and you are furnished with a key which will naturally and consistently account for all its much disputed acceptations. You have only to observe that a person or thing may be either *popped into* water or any other fluid, or may have water or any other fluid *popped upon*, or *popped into*, him or it, and the whole mystery vanishes.

"Having thus translated the word baptism, which we have been often challenged to do, we are prepared to show that it signifies the application, properly the sudden and slight application, of water or some other liquid; but, in a more lax sense, the application of it in any manner, or for any purpose; by effusion, affusion, perfusion, or infusion, by sprinkling, daubing, friction, or immersion, wholly or partially, permanently or for a moment; for purifying or defiling, ornamenting or bespattering, washing away what was found adhering, or covering with what was not there before." (Pages 28, 29.)...

"We are led to conceive of baptism as the pouring out of water from a cup, on the turned-up face of the baptized; and whether he be adult or in infancy, it may thus not only wet the surface as a figure of washing, but be drunk into the mouth, as the emblem of a principle of new life, and of continual support and refreshment; of a source of spiritual and heavenly consolation, and of a willingness given, or to be given, to the baptized, to receive whatever may be assigned him as his portion. We are led to this conception of baptism by various passages of scripture, which it will be found to illustrate. The cup which I refer to is the כף, cup of nature, that is, the hollow of the human hand." (Page 67.)...

Cross-examined. "Βαπτιζω. I plunge, or sink completely under water; used only in the passive voice, and in a neuter sense. I cover partially with water. I overwhelm or cover with water, by rushing, flowing, or pouring upon. I drench or impregnate with liquor by effusion. I pour abundantly upon, so as to wet thoroughly. I infuse. I oppress, or overwhelm, by bringing burdens, or affliction, or distress. I wash in general, without specifying the mode; that is, I cover with water the body, or the part of the body, that is to be washed. I wash, for the special purpose of symbolical, ritual, or ceremonial purification. I administer the ordinance of christian baptism. I baptize." (See his Greek Lexicon.)

The Eighth Witness said, "I have been deputed by eleven of my brethren, ministers of the gospel, to appear on behalf of the plaintiffs before this honourable court; and seeing that they "most cordially unite in recommending" me, I am authorised to declare, that the evidence I shall give will be in unison with their opinions. And further, that they are severally and jointly willing to be considered as speaking through my mouth. In sending me before you, they expressed their assurance, that I should make "a direct appeal to divine revelation and authentic history;" that my statements would be "fair and accurate," my "criticisms learned and solid," my "reasonings manly and conclusive;" and that, throughout my evidence, I should display "the spirit and manners of the gentleman and the christian." And it pleased them also to flatter me by saying, that their chief motive in sending me here was, that my testimony might be "circulated to the extent which its merits" would "deserve." (Recommendation of his Dissertations on Christian Baptism.) This premised, I shall proceed.

"There are some worthy and good persons (extremely strange to consider) who lay so great a stress upon this trivial circumstance (baptism) in religion, as to allow none to be baptized christians but those who have been dipt — to break off christian fellowship, and renounce communion of saints, with men of the most shining piety, if they have not been *thus* baptized — and even to think themselves obliged to be unwearied in raising doubts and anxieties in the breasts of such, concerning the validity and truth of their baptism.

"Many pious but weak minds have been greatly disturbed, not to say distressed, with scruples on this head. When they hear it confidently affirmed, That baptism evermore and constantly implies dipping — that no person ever was, or can be baptized, who has not been *dipt* — and consequently that themselves are as really *unbaptized* as *Pagans* or *Turks*, it fills them with concern. They doubt whether they are not wanting in obedience to an express command and institution of Christ.

"Effectually to remove every scruple of this kind, to show that there is no occasion for putting this 'yoke upon the neck of the disciples,' and to vindicate CHRISTIANITY from the unworthy imputation of laying so great stress upon so merely *circumstantial* and *external* a thing, is the design of" my "ensuing" evidence. "How far it shall be effectual to answer this purpose, is humbly left to the favour of heaven, and to the calm and impartial judgment of" this court. (Pages 74, 75.)...

What I intend "to prove," is, "First, that dipping the body under water, was not the only ancient and scriptural way of baptizing. And, secondly, that if it was, yet a strict adherence to it is not obligatory upon us, but that this *circumstance* may very lawfully and properly be now exchanged for that of *sprinkling* or *pouring*." (Page 77.)...

1. "We are wont to consider baptism as a purely christian institution, and to trace it to no higher origin than JESUS CHRIST or *John* the Baptist. But this is certainly wrong. Baptism was unquestionably a divine institution, practised as a religious and sacred ceremony in the church of God ages before. There were divers kinds of baptisms, the apostle expressly says (Heb. ix. 10), in which the worship of God stood under the Jewish dispensation. Neither John nor our Saviour did properly institute this rite, but only took this ancient, standing, religious institution, and applied it to a particular purpose in their mission. (Page 78.)...

"That the word Βαπτιζω does not necessarily nor constantly signify to dip, but is very frequently, if not generally, used in sacred writ in a more large and extensive sense, and signifies an application of water by *sprinkling* or *pouring*, has been evidently shown, and the whole learned world (an anti-pedobaptist or two perhaps excepted,) readily acknowledged. (See a cloud of witnesses, from lexicographers, divines, grammarians, in "Walker's Doctrine of Baptism," page 113.)

"Forasmuch as the water, in christian baptism applied to the body, is confessedly but an emblematical or figurative thing, and was intended to represent some spiritual blessing to be imparted to the soul; and forasmuch as this spiritual blessing which is intended to be represented by it is in the Old Testament often spoken of as to be given, when the New should take place, under the emblem of water *sprinkled* or *poured out*, it follows that if the word Βαπτιζω, to baptize, will at all admit of this sense, then it is perfectly agreeable to the analogy of scripture to administer the baptismal water by *sprinkling* or *pouring*." (Page 101.)...

"Viewing the matter with the eye of impartial reason, pouring water on the body as effectually and fully answers all the moral ends of baptism as dipping into it, yea, is much more significative of one principal thing intended to be represented or signified by this christian rite, namely, the *giving us the Holy Spirit*, that *unction from above* which is poured down upon us." (Page 115.)...

"Without a good degree of these (hardiness of constitution and bodily strength,) in a variety of cases which must frequently occur, it will be rash and highly criminal for a christian minister to give this sacred rite of religion to some of the most worthy and capable subjects; inasmuch as he cannot do it without apparent hazard, not only to his own life, but to that also of the baptized....

"Should immersion be allowed to have been the only ancient, apostolic, and scriptural mode of baptizing, yet a strict adherence to it is not obligatory on us; but this circumstance may very lawfully and fitly be exchanged for that of sprinkling or pouring.

"To be satisfied of this, we need but consider, what is the true spirit and design of christianity, which the apostle calls 'a law of liberty,' (James i. 25.) That a great part of its intention was to take off men's regard from things ritual and ceremonial. It is a doctrine according 'to godliness.'...

'To imagine, therefore, that our Lord intended absolutely and

immutably to bind down his followers, of all nations, and of all ages, to the Jewish form of baptizing, supposing it to have been by dipping only, is quite repugnant to that mild, that generous and free spirit which his religion everywhere breathes. And here it is natural to observe...

"That even under the Jewish, which was confessedly a weak and ceremonial dispensation, and which laid infinitely more weight upon ritual observances than the christian religion does, a liberty was given to human prudence to dispense with some of the most express and most solemn institutions, in cases where only mercy or great convenience required it.

"Thus the rite of circumcision, though enjoined under the awful penalty to the neglecter of 'being cut off' (Gen. xvii. 14), was yet without offence laid aside for the space of forty years. (Josh. v. 6.)...

"So, by an express command, none but the priests were to eat of the 'hallowed or shew bread.' Yet David and his men, when no other supply could conveniently be had, violated this injunction; they eat of that bread which it was not 'lawful for them to eat,' and are justified by Christ. (Matt. xii. 4.)

"So also the 'brazen serpent,' which was set up by the command of God, honoured by many great and miraculous cures, and designed probably to be an instructive memorial to future ages... was yet, when abused to superstition, broken down by Hezekiah, and actually destroyed. (Numb. xxi. 8, 9; 2 Kings xviii. 4.) (Pages 119—122.)...

"Total immersions are, in this country and age, an unusual, a troublesome, a scarcely modest and decent, and in many cases a cruel and very dangerous thing; especially as the form of pouring is every whit as significant as that of dipping can be. (Page 124)...

"Our divine Legislator hath hereby (his remarks on the disciples' plucking the ears of corn,) taught us to reason thus. When the strict observance of a merely ritual command will be attended with danger and great inconvenience to the disciples, it may lawfully be waived. Or thus: *baptism* was made for *man*, and not man for baptism. If, therefore, through any change of national custom, or of climate, the form of dipping in baptism should become odd and unbecoming ... hazardous to the health, or troublesome to the disciples, it might then be innocently waived, and a form less burdensome and disagreeable be substituted in its room. In other words: whether it be not as much mercy to excuse some at least (viz., new

born infants, weakly and unhealthy persons, and even all others, throughout the winter season, in these northern and cold climates,) from being totally plunged in baptism, as it was to excuse the twelve for plucking and rubbing the corn on the Sabbath-day?" (Pages 128, 129.)...

The NINTH WITNESS said,—"The duties we owe to God are in scripture summed up in the word 'godliness,' the foundation of which, and of duties of every other kind, is that entire

"SUBMISSION TO GOD, which springs from a due sense of that relation in which we stand to him as creatures.

"The will of God is the only rule to man, in every thing on which that will has declared itself; and, as it lays its injunctions upon the heart as well as the life, the rule is equally in force when it directs our *opinions*, our *motives*, and *affections*, as when it enjoins or prohibits external acts....

"The will of God, which is the rule of duty, is authenticated by the whole of that stupendous evidence which proves the scriptures to be of divine original.

"That will at once defines and enforces every branch of inward and outward purity, rectitude, and benevolence.

"It annuls by its authority every other rule of conduct contrary to itself, whether it arise from custom, or from the example, persuasion, or opinions of others.

"It is a rule which admits not of being bound to the weak and fallen state of human nature....

"It accommodates not itself to the interests or even safety of men, but requires that interest, honour, liberty, and life should be surrendered, rather than it should sustain any violation.

"It admits no exceptions in obedience, but requires it *whole* and *entire;* so that outward virtue cannot be taken in the place of that which has its seat in the heart: and it allows no acts to be really virtuous, but those which spring from a willing and submissive mind, and are done upon the vital principle of a distinct recognition of our rightful subjection to God." (Theological Institutes, pages 233, 234.)...

"The number of sacraments is held by all Protestants to be but two, Baptism and the Lord's Supper; because they find no other instituted in the New Testament, or practised in the early churches. (Page 381.)...

"Although the manner in which the element of water is applied in baptism is but a circumstance of the sacrament, it will not be a matter of surprise, to those who reflect upon the proneness of men to attach undue importance to comparative trifles, that it has produced so much controversy. The question as to the proper *subjects* of baptism is one which is to be respected for its importance; that as to the *mode* has occupied more time, and excited greater feeling, than it is in my view entitled to. It cannot, however, be passed over, because the advocates for immersion are often very troublesome to their fellow-christians, unsettle weak minds, and sometimes, perhaps, from their zeal for a form, endanger their own spirituality. Against the doctrine that the only legitimate mode of baptizing is by immersion, we may first observe that there are several strong *presumptions.*

"1. It is not probable that, if immersion were the only allowable mode of baptism, it should not have been expressly enjoined.

"2. It is not probable that, in a religion designed to be universal, a mode of administering this ordinance should be obligatory, the practice of which is ill-adapted to so many climates, where it would either be exceedingly harsh to immerse the candidates, male and female, strong and feeble, in water; or, in some places, as in the higher latitudes, for a great part of the year impossible. Even if immersion were in fact the original mode of baptizing in the name of Christ, these reasons make it improbable that no accommodation of the form should take place without vitiating the ordinance....

"3. It is still more unlikely that, in a religion of mercy, there should be no consideration of health and life in the administration of an ordinance of salvation; since it is certain that, in countries where cold bathing is little practised, great risk of both is often incurred, especially in the case of women and delicate persons of either sex, and fatal effects do sometimes occur.

"4. It is also exceedingly improbable that, in such circumstances of climate, and the unfrequent use of the bath, a mode of baptizing should have been appointed, which, from the shivering, the sobbing, and other bodily uneasiness produced, should distract the thoughts, and unfit the mind for a collected performance of a religious and solemn act of devotion.

"5. It is highly improbable that the three thousand converts at the pentecost, who, let it be observed, were baptized on the same day, were all baptized by immersion; or that the jailor and 'all his'

were baptized in the same manner, in *the night*, although the Baptists have invented 'a tank or bath in the prison at Philippi' for that purpose.

"Finally. It is most of all improbable, that a religion like the christian, so scrupulously delicate, should have enjoined the immersion of women by men, and in the presence of men. In an after age, when immersion came into fashion, baptistries, and rooms for women, and changes of garments, and other auxiliaries to this practice, came into use, because they were found necessary to decency; but there could be no such conveniences in the first instance, and accordingly we read of none. With all the arrangements of modern times, baptism by immersion is not a decent practice. There is not a female, perhaps, who submits to it, who has not a great previous struggle with her delicacy; but that, at a time when no such accommodations could be had as have since been found necessary, such a ceremony should have been constantly performing, wherever the apostles and first preachers went, and that at pools and rivers in the presence of many spectators, and they sometimes unbelievers and scoffers, is a thing not rationally credible.

"We grant that the practice of immersion is ancient, and so are many other superstitious appendages to baptism, which were adopted under the notion of making the rite more emblematical and impressive. We not only trace immersion to the second century, but immersion three times, anointing with oil, signing with the sign of the cross, imposition of hands, exorcism, eating milk and honey, putting on white garments, all connected with baptism, and first mentioned by Tertullian; the invention of men like himself, who, with much genius and eloquence, had little judgment, and were superstitious to a degree worthy of the darkest ages which followed. It was this authority for immersion which led Wall, and other writers on the side of infant baptism, to surrender the point to the anti-pedobaptists, and to conclude that immersion was the apostolic practice. Several national churches, too, like our own, swayed by the same authority, are favourable to immersion, although they do not think it binding, and generally practise effusion, or sprinkling." (Pages 429—431.)...

"In the absence, therefore, of all proof, that in any instance found in the New Testament baptism was administered by immersion, with so many presumptions against that indecent practice as have been stated; with the decisive evidence, also, of a *designed*

correspondence between the baptism, *the pouring out* of the Holy Spirit, and the baptism, *the pouring out* of water; we may conclude with confidence that the latter was the apostolic mode of administering that ordinance, and that first washing, and then immersion, were introduced later, towards the latter end of the second century, along with several other superstitious additions to this important sacrament, originating in that 'will-worship' which presumed to destroy the simplicity of God's ordinances, under the pretence of rendering them more emblematical and impressive. Even if immersion had been the original mode of baptizing, we should, in the absence of any command on the subject, direct or implied, have thought the church at liberty to accommodate the manner of applying water to the body, in the name of the Trinity, in which the essence of the rite consists, to different climates and manners; but it is satisfactory to discover, that all the attempts made to impose upon christians a practice repulsive to the feelings, dangerous to the health, and offensive to delicacy, is destitute of all scriptural authority, and of really primitive practice....To say that it figures our spiritual death and resurrection, as we have seen, has no authority from the texts used to prove it; and to make a sudden pop under water to be emblematical of burial, is as far-fetched a conceit as any which adorns the Emblems of Quarles, without any portion of the ingenuity." (Page 444.)...

The Tenth Witness said,—"It was far from my intention to" come before this court to give my testimony, "had not the officious zeal of" our opponents "become quite intolerable. (Page 53.)... To be attacked as an individual, and that publicly from the press, I cannot help calling unhandsome. The principles (modes of baptism) no doubt may be attacked in this way if they be thought wrong, but" as I am "only one of thousands who hold them...I cannot surely for this be a sinner above all that dwell" round me. (Page 1.) ..."Necessity therefore is upon me, and I am obliged either to defend myself, or submit to be trampled under foot." (Page 53.)... "Nothing has been preached by me, but what I publicly profess to believe, and am solemnly bound by my ordination vows to declare." (Page 1.)... To provoke a controversy is by no means my wish, and especially a religious wrangling like this." (Page 53.)...

Our opponents always begin by trusting to an arm of flesh, and telling us that, "according to learned authors, "Βαπτιζω signifies

to dip, and εις signifies into; and then, *taking this for granted*, all goes on smoothly; a person must be dipped of course, when he is baptized. But" they "take care not to quote scripture texts in support of this opinion, nor yet to give Matt. xxviii. 19, according to their translation, and tell the people what it says they are dipped into. They are never informed that the baptismal statute, (which is considered by men of" their "persuasion as containing a complete directory for every thing necessary to the right administration of baptism,) contains not one word about water, nor any thing like dipping into water. No, this would make discoveries, and therefore common men, who always understand the elements to be water, are left in pious ignorance about these things." (Page 39.)...

"As pedobaptists maintain that a person may have all that is essential to baptism by being either sprinkled or dipt, it will not be of much consequence on my principles whether an instance of this kind (the same word used to signify sprinkling,) can be given or not. If Βαπτιζω can be shown to signify sometimes one thing, and sometimes another; and if it can be shown that in the new Testament it will neither bear to be translated to dip, nor to sprinkle, when employed to express the ordinance of baptism, it will be quite enough for my purpose; but it will not do for" theirs. "Dipping is of such importance according to" their "system, that there can be no christian baptism unless the *whole body* be immersed in water. Βαπτιζω, then, the particular word which the Spirit of God employs to express this ordinance, must signify to dip, and always to dip, when expressive of this ordinance, or" their "cause is lost. This is plain; for if it signifies sometimes to dip, and sometimes to sprinkle, baptism may be administered either way, at least so far as this word is concerned. And if, in relation to this ordinance, it will neither bear to be translated to dip, nor to sprinkle, then this leading word in the baptismal statute leaves us at liberty, unless we have a positive command for dipping somewhere else, and this, I believe," they "will not so much as pretend is the case. On the scriptural meaning, then, of this particular word the controversy turns; and without its aid" they "have nothing left that can support" their "system. Going down to the water, and coming up from the water, will do nothing, if Βαπτιζω does not dip the whole body when the person is there. Let us then proceed to examine whether the New Testament meaning of this word be to dip or immerse the whole body, and whether it always signifies so when connected with baptism.

And pray let them "recollect that if it does not, and if but one instance can be found against" them, "dipping as the only *mode* of baptism is a lost cause."...

"This word Βαπτιζω occurs about seventy times in the New Testament. It is the only word, as far as I can discover, which the Spirit of God employs to express the ordinance of baptism, and it is never in one instance translated to dip or immerse. Of this" they "can perhaps satisfy themselves, by searching the Greek New Testament. And if" they "find there one single instance in which it is either translated to dip, or can be fairly shown to signify the immersion of the whole body," they "will find what I cannot.

"There are perhaps cases in which it is doubtful, such as in Matt. vii. 4, where the things said to be baptized might be washed, either by having water poured on them, or by being dipt in water; but I say, though there may be some cases in which it is doubtful, there is not one decisive enough for" them! "And remember," Gentlemen, "they should all be decisive on" their "side, for ten, or even twenty, will not save" their "system.

"But let us try an instance or two, that the world may know whether we prophesy out of our own hearts, or whether we speak according to what is noted in the scriptures of truth. And as" they "put this task upon me, I would refer" them "for one instance, to Acts i. 5. 'For John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.' This instance I select for three reasons. The first is, that the passage is mentioned at least six times in the New Testament. The second is, that it refers to John's baptizing in Jordan, on which so much has been built. And the third is, that scripture history tells us particularly in what manner this promise was fulfilled, when the disciples were baptized with the Holy Ghost. Let us then," gentlemen, "look up the passages, and see whether it was by dipping or sprinkling; and here we shall have the certainty of scripture explaining scripture for our guide. Look forward, then, only two verses, to Acts i. 8, and you will find in what way Christ, when he mentioned the promise, meant this baptism with the Holy Ghost to be administered. Now nothing, one would think, could be more certain than the speaker's explanation of his own words; and he says, in regard to the mode of this baptism, 'ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is *come upon* you.' This, then, will not do for dipping, or" they "must adopt a new mode. The next passage in which

this baptism is mentioned, you find in Acts ii. 3. It contains the accomplishment of what Christ had said; and what do" they "find done? 'There appeared unto them cloven tongues, like as of fire, and it *sat upon* each of them.' This will not do either, for as to the foolish notion of being immersed in a *sound* which filled the house, it will be of no service to dipping, till you put people in a dry baptistry, and pour water about them. Besides, it was not the sound of the wind, but the symbol of tongues, which was the emblem of the Holy Ghost.

"The third account we have of this matter is in Acts ii. 17, 18. where Peter explains it to be the fulfilment of a particular prophecy, and tells us in what way God himself said the disciples should be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Now pray," gentlemen, "notice the words, 'And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will *pour out* of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams, and *on* my servants and on my handmaidens I will *pour out* in those days of my Spirit, and they shall prophesy.' Look forward to verse 33, and you find Peter again mentioning this baptism of the Holy Ghost, and he tells his audience that Christ shed forth that which they saw and heard. But you know," gentlemen, "shedding forth will not do for dipping. There are still two or three passages more, where this baptism is mentioned; these are, Acts viii. 16, and x. 44, 45, and xi. 15, 16. In all these places the mode of baptism with the Holy Ghost is particularly mentioned, and in all of them we are assured it was by *pouring out*, and falling upon, and never by dipping or immersion."...

"Now," gentlemen, "does it not appear from these passages that" their "sentiments are the doctrines of men opposed to the declarations of the great God? Let" them "examine them, they will bear examination, and bring conviction of" their "error too, if" they "are not refusing to be ashamed.

"These are all the accounts I can find of this matter. They all, you see, notice the particular mode in which men were baptized by the Holy Ghost, and they all, with one consent, declare it was not by dipping, or any thing resembling it, but by *pouring out*, and *falling upon;* and this is just sprinkling, in other words. Now, whether this is not an instance of the above Greek word literally signifying sprinkling, or *pouring out upon*, I leave to" themselves. "When"

they "have given me as clear an instance, from the New Testament, of its signifying dipping, we shall be equal. No—equal!—what did I say?"—they "will then have proved that baptism may be administered either by dipping or sprinkling, because Βαπτιζω signifies both." They "will then have proved my opinion to be right, and" theirs, "that dipping is the *only mode* of baptism, wrong." (Pages 6—12.)...

"I shall honestly acknowledge there is certainly a particular and specific use of water in the ordinance of baptism, Nay, I have no hesitation in declaring this to be my humble opinion, that the particular and specific use of water in baptism is to apply it to the body, so as to represent the application of Christ's purifying blood and Spirit to the soul. Well, let me ask them in what way are these said in scripture to be applied to the soul for cleansing it from sin? This ought certainly to be the way in which water should be applied to the body to represent that cleansing.

"And I am much mistaken indeed if" they "can find one instance of dipping in the blood and spirit of Christ for this purpose, in all the Bible. Scripture never speaks in this style, so far as I know, nor ever suggests such an idea as plunging in the precious blood of of the Son of God. No. Sprinkling with this precious blood is sufficient to sanctify the *whole man*, and therefore sprinkling is the usual style in which scripture speaks on this subject. Hence it calls this blood 'the blood of sprinkling.'" (See Heb. xii. 24; x. 22; 1 Pet. i. 2.)

"Now," gentlemen, "do" they "ask me what is the most natural and determinate sense of the verb Βαπτιζω? I say, as employed to express the ordinance of baptism, it signifies the application of water to the body, so as to represent the application of Christ's blood and Spirit to the soul; and there is no single word in the English language, so far as I know, which comes up to its *full meaning*. The verb to wash, perhaps comes nearest it, and our translators of the Bible have sometimes rendered it into English by this verb to wash....I have now" declared "frankly and fearlessly what I think is the determinate meaning of this word Βαπτιζω, and what is the specific use of water in baptism; and I could almost appeal to our" opponents "if this be not a fair argument, and a legitimate conclusion....Therefore *dipping*, in baptism, is completely at variance with the scriptures, and the *sprinkling* of that precious blood which it is intended to represent." (Page 20—23.)...

"Every thing I have seen advanced, as *scripture proof that dipping is the only mode of baptism*, and if my prejudices are not uncommonly strong, it is as pitiful a cause as ever scripture was brought to prove. This, however, would not be worth noticing, if the pitiful proof were not made to support a doctrine which unchurches almost the whole world. With" them, "if there be no dipping, there is no baptism; if there be no baptism, there is no visible church membership. This sweeping doctrine, then, declares the visible church of Christ is confined to those who are dipped. All else, though eminent as a Harvey, a Henry, or an Owen, or any body else, are not so much as visible church members; and if they went to heaven, it was not through the medium of the visible church. This is an awful doctrine, and should not be supported by slender proof. Nothing but the clearest evidence should convince any man that a doctrine so unchristian could ever be countenanced by Christ.

"If pedobaptists were not able to prove their opinions clearly, there would still be this to recommend them, that they are charitable ones. With them the particular mode of baptism is not a matter of such importance. For they allow that a person may have all that is essential to baptism by being either sprinkled or dipped; and that godly persons of every christian denomination are visible church members." (Page 42, 43.)

COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANTS.

The examination of the Witnesses for the Plaintiffs, on the subjects before mentioned, being concluded, the Counsel for the Defendants rose and addressed the Court in the following terms:—

My Lord, and Gentlemen of the Jury,

Before I bring forward the evidence which I shall have to submit to you, it will be my duty to address you, in behalf of my clients, on the all-important subjects which have engaged your attention. I feel that the task I have undertaken involves a responsibility of the deepest moment, not only requiring sound knowledge of the Will, but the exercise of a sovereign, directing Power, to enable me to apply that knowledge rightly. Looking up to, and relying on, that Power for assistance, I do not fear, but rather covet the honour of combating with the learned, popular, and select characters whom my learned friend has arrayed against us,—characters whose fame has spread over the length and breadth of the land. Should I succeed in demonstrating the fallacy of their doctrines, of which I have no doubt, the influence upon society will be far more beneficial than if they were the doctrines of men of less celebrity. I beseech you, therefore, my Lord and gentlemen, to hear me patiently.

Gentlemen of the Jury—It is hardly necessary for me to declare, in the presence of the court, that I have no personal animosity towards any of the plaintiffs. On the contrary, I would that they were all brought "unto the knowledge of the truth."* It is their unscriptural errors only, their erroneous views of the contents of the Will, that I oppose. My path of duty is plain and straightforward, namely, to convince you that my clients are the individuals "whose names are in the book of life."† Succeeding in this, I shall win for them not only your decision in their favour, but the thanks of a grateful posterity.

* 1 Tim. ii. 4. † Phil. iv. 3.

Another preliminary remark, and I shall proceed.

I must here, once for all, protest against the plaintiffs appropriating to that rite which they come here to maintain, the term Baptism, a term to which it has no pretension. To distinguish it from baptism, I shall always denominate it "Christening," a denomination authorized by the Establishment, in what she calls "The Ministration of Private Baptism," and which is well understood by all our opponents. While, to the ordinance of the gospel I shall give its proper and appropriate name, BAPTISM,—a name authorized by the Testator himself.

There is, gentlemen, no cause on record in anywise similar to, or worthy of comparison with, the one before you. We have therefore no precedents for our guide, save those only which we shall be able to deduce from the Will. Nevertheless, I feel assured that the precepts and examples which that document contains will be sufficient of themselves to satisfy you that our title is clear; and that I may regard all which my learned friend and his witnesses have advanced, or may hereafter advance, from other sources to the contrary, as of no authority whatever. We can admit of no appeal, but "to the law and to the testimony."* Resting my cause on these, I shall do my duty fearlessly, regardless alike of the scoffs and reproaches that, outside these doors, may await me. Without occupying more of your time, and while the evidence that has just been given is fresh in your memory, I request your careful and candid attention to my reply.

Had it not been for the evidence of the First Witness, such of you as may not understand a word of Greek might have been startled, when the Tenth Witness referred you for proof of the meaning of the word Βαπτιζω to the Greek Testament. But as the former is an eminent linguist, you need feel no alarm.

The evidence of the plaintiff's leading Witness is in accordance with the opinion held by a majority of the learned men of the day, and what is his evidence? Why, that the translators of the English version of the Will *have seized the very spirit and soul of the original.* Well then, gentlemen, with this evidence from the plaintiffs themselves, they cannot object to our making the translation in question the standard by which this mighty cause shall stand or fall.

And you will have observed, gentlemen, that this their leading Witness has asserted that those that are immersed are evangelically

* Isa. viii. 20.

baptized. In addition to which, he earnestly recommends to your notice the observations of the learned Dr. Lightfoot, (and as he recommends them, I shall treat them as his own, as I shall, after the same manner, treat the quotations of the other witnesses,) who proves "that the baptism of John was by plunging the body." Thus he has, at the very outset, given you the proper translation of the verb baptize, and so far positively witnessed in our favour.

And yet he has at the same time asserted, that this ordinance of the Testator is so *harsh* and *dangerous* that it *scarcely* gives place to circumcision. Must you not, gentlemen, wonder that this can have been said by one, who also asserted that he came before you "free from bias and sectarian feeling." Surely he cannot expect you to look upon the latter assertion as only a "spot that may fairly be attributed to human frailty."

We have also in our favour, thus early, the evidence of the Second Witness. He does "not deny the lawfulness of baptizing by immersion," but says, it is the signification of the element that ought to be attended to. So say we, gentlemen; but let him show of what sprinkling is significant, as we shall presently show of what baptism is. The comparison he makes between circumcision and baptism is a sorry one, and will not bear discussion; while that between the supper and baptism is incongruous, because the eating of a smaller or larger piece of bread, or drinking a little less or a little more wine, if so be that it is drank, not merely tasted, makes no difference in celebrating the supper. But the manner in which water is used in baptism does make a difference, that admits not of comparison, because it is impossible that those who are taught of God would consent either to sprinkle or to be sprinkled.* What he asserts of sealing, conveying, and confirming, is no evidence, because it wants confirmation; while his assertion that a few drops of water are equal in effect to the waters of the main ocean, being only a vagary of his own brain, I must hold to be unworthy of notice. Does it not appear strange, gentlemen, that although he does not deny the lawfulness of "baptizing by immersion," nor of "dipping," in some cases, he should reject it in every case, and substitute for it the unscriptural and perilous rite of sprinkling?

Even the Tenth Witness himself allows that the verb to wash comes the nearest of any other word in our language to the Greek verb Βαπτιζω; aye, further also, "that a person may have all that

* Col. ii. 20—22.

is essential to baptism by being dipped." But, gentlemen, that washing is not baptizing we have proof positive, in Acts xvi. 16. The jailer *washed* the stripes of Paul and Silas; and Paul and Silas *baptized* the jailer "and all his." We have also proof in Lev. xiv. 26, 27, that pouring is not sprinkling, nor sprinkling pouring. The priest was commanded to *pour* oil into his left hand, and to *sprinkle* some of it with his right finger. Consequently the words baptizing, washing, pouring, sprinkling, are not synonymous, and can never be legitimately used to express the same action. It may be averred, therefore, without fear of refutation, that our opponents, by being either sprinkled, or effused, or washed, are no more baptized than they are circumcised. Yet you have observed, gentlemen, how this witness jumped to the conclusion that "pouring out, and falling upon, was just sprinkling in other words." He must have forgotten, or never known, that it was when the Testator went up out of the water that the Holy Ghost fell upon him; and that in his person we have a manifest instance both of literal and metaphorical baptism. Speaking the truth, gentlemen, unchurches no one; it only points out who are, or who are not, of the church.* Let him whose ears tingle at the sound of it "examine himself, whether he be in the faith"! "Woe unto them that are wise in their own eyes, and prudent in their own sight."†

Gentlemen, the right understanding of the ordinance of baptism is of mighty moment; for we must truly confess "that Jesus Christ is Lord," before we can in anywise "give glory to God the Father."‡ And the convert's first available confession is that made at the time of his baptism; according as it is written, "Whosoever shall confess me before men, him shall the Son of Man also confess before the angels of God."§ It is by this confession that we establish our claim to, and become partakers of, all the privileges and immunities devised by the Testator, who has declared, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."‖ In fact, gentlemen, genuine baptism may be denominated the way of entrance into the kingdom; for the Will, while it points out no other, particularly specifies that there is only ONE baptism.

Now, gentlemen, only imagine for one moment, if the statements of the witnesses should be correct, the painful situation in which the whole world would be placed; for who could discover, from their

* See Rom. ii. 28, 29. † Isa. v. 21. ‡ Phil. ii. 11.
§ Luke xii. 8. ‖ Mark xvi. 16.

evidence which of the four meanings they give to the word Βαπτιζω is the specified one. Speaking after the manner of men, we might say the Will must go into Chancery, and there remain until the Testator comes a second time, to explain it; for no man could prove an interest in it.

But, Gentlemen, while these Witnesses assert this one word to have four distinct meanings, some of them are anxious to prove that it is only according to one or two of its meanings that the ordinance ought to be administered; while others of them come to no conclusion at all. In fact, the subject appears too abstruse for them; no one of them seems to be convinced of the correctness of his own statements. How then is it possible that they can convince this court of the justice of their claim, or enlighten "the comparatively simple"? Indeed, they do not come forward with the courage of men who have right on their side, and "without courage there cannot be TRUTH, and without truth there can be no virtue."

One of the Witnesses candidly acknowledges that his evidence will not afford him pleasure. Another wishes the duty of appearing in court had fallen on some one else. Another meets with many objections to the Established Church, and finds that unadulterated christianity is not exactly what her creeds and articles represent it. Another has been compelled to give up one set of opinions, and has yet to learn whether those he has adopted are any better than those he has discarded. Another does not know whether he shall succeed or fail. Another admits that his opponents have long ago been shouting victory. Another does not know how far his evidence shall be effectual to answer the purpose for which he came here. Another allows that the defendants are very troublesome, and that they unsettle weak minds. And another, that if he cannot prove his arguments clearly, (an evident admission that he cannot,) they are to be recommended for their charity. Mark, gentlemen, that ominous word IF; it is destructive of his evidence; while what he terms charity, is now one of the leading deceptions of the great enemy of man.

You recollect, gentlemen, that these Witnesses, after having to the utmost of their power decried the ordinance of the Testator, by describing it as harsh, cruel, dangerous to health and life, highly criminal, unfit for all climates, troublesome, scarcely modest and decent, offensive to delicacy, and destitute of all scriptural authority, a pitiful cause, an indecent practice, an unchristian doctrine; yet

turned round, and asserted, on behalf of our opponents, that they believe those who are dipt to be evangelically baptized; that they do not deny the lawfulness of immersion—that immersion is doubtless baptism—that it may be administered by immersion; that Βαπτιζω signifies to immerse; that they find little or no fault with the principles of the anti-pedobaptists; and that a person may have all that is essential to baptism by being dipped. Their decrial of the ordinance proves their hatred of it; while their assertions are convincing evidence that they believe our view of the Will to be correct, and are aware the cause they came here to maintain is untenable.

You recollect, also, gentlemen, that the Third and Seventh Witnesses differed materially from the others. The former said, baptism, or washing in water, was the easiest institution that could have been invented; the latter, that no great hardship could be experienced in any climate were the practice enjoined every day; that it would be a very extraordinary constitution which could not at any age "well endure" to be plunged once in its life. The statements of the latter, you will allow, are in accordance with common sense; and that there must be great perversity in the other witnesses, who condemn as dangerous, when practised in obedience to a divine command, that which is generally allowed to invigorate the constitution, when practised either in obedience to medical advice, or as a mere matter of pleasure or healthy recreation. And I am persuaded you will also agree with me, that no indelicacy can attach to a female, in thus fulfilling the commands of her Saviour, save only in the breasts of those who despise his institution, and therefore always speak of it with obloquy. Nor can you have forgotten, gentlemen, that although the Ninth Witness was the loudest in vituperation, he had previously declared, that the "Will of God," whose will it was that John should baptize with water, "does not accommodate itself to the interests, or even the safety, of men, but requires that interest, honour, liberty, and life should be surrendered, rather than it should sustain any violation."

Observe, too, that the Third Witness, in asserting that the "Testator willed baptism as the ordinance by which those that believed in him should be admitted to the privileges of his religion," absolutely gives up the cause. To say nothing of the grand error which he fell into when he asserted that the operation of the Spirit must be administered through the mediation of water. Man baptizes with water, but God alone baptizes with the Spirit.

The First Witness, as I have before observed, has also given his evidence positively in our favour, by admitting that which we were brought here to defend, *i. e.*, immersion of believers in water; to the latter, the Third subscribes; and to the former, the Second; while we have the Fourth, not only giving his evidence positively, but negatively also; insomuch that he witnesses against the plaintiffs, by saying that "true christianity is not what the creeds and articles of *the* church represent it;" and in favour of the defendants, by admitting that immersion is doubtless baptism. Βαπτιζω, he says, is derived from Βαπτω, to dip or immerse; to prove which he brings forward three texts, and the texts by which he shows that the word is often used symbolically, does not at all militate against its literal meaning. He asserts, that whether the rite was administered by immersion or not, is incapable of decisive proof, and yet he has not only most solemnly subscribed that it is to be administered by dipping, but he has sealed his subscription by participating of the Lord's supper, and still abides by it. Gentlemen, is this the "effect of error, and not of design"?

Gentlemen, if this Witness had been desirous to establish the uprightness of his character, and convince you "that he kept nothing back," would he not have declared which of the three ceremonies, immersion, sprinkling, or pouring, was in his opinion the ordinance to which the apostle Paul alludes, when he says there is only ONE baptism; more especially as he has *acknowledged*, hundreds of times, that there is only one baptism for the remission of sin?* and how can *one* baptism vary in its administration, "as occasion may require"? Are there not here symptoms of fear lest he should incur reproach? This is the Witness who would have no fear of "telling a most audacious lie in the sight of God," of subscribing articles, for the sake of preferment, with mental reservation, while declaring he could not unreservedly subscribe them for filthy lucre's sake! And what is preferment, gentlemen? Is it not filthy lucre, though in another guise? What must be the state of that church, the welfare of which is entrusted to men of this character,—whose almost universal conduct, according to this Witness, is something similar to his own? Again: this Witness is at variance both with the gospel of our blessed Lord, and the rubrics of his own church. He admits of three baptisms—by immersion, and sprinkling, and pouring; while the former admits but of ONE only, immersion; and the latter of only *two*,

* See the Nicene Creed.

dipping and pouring; while it is an exception to the general rule of the church, when either the one or the other is practised. Is it not, gentlemen, an hypocritical act, a sin of the deepest dye, to teach doctrines which he himself affirms to be contrary to the gospel? Does the reservation at all alter the responsibility of the subscription? Does not the acknowledgment of his disbelief of the articles make the subscription of them a more sinful act? Or does the confession of a sin furnish any authority for its repetition? Allow me to bring to your recollection, gentlemen, the words of this Witness;—"the law of Moses prescribed divers washings, or baptisms, in which water was used in different ways;" and I will prove to you, out of his own mouth, that not one of these washings was the baptism of the whole body. He says, in his "Explanatory Notes on the Bible,"* "The word here rendered *wash* is very frequently translated *bathe*;† but it is obvious that it cannot exclusively mean the covering of the whole body with water, for there was no provision made for this, either in the holy place, or in the court of the tabernacle, which probably induced the translators to render it *wash* in this connexion. But whether the hands or feet alone were washed, or some of the other parts of the body, or every part of it, seems to have depended on circumstances." Surely, gentlemen, this evidence, coming as it does from one of the Plaintiffs' own Witnesses, —one who, for his biblical knowledge is highly esteemed among them, —ought to shut their mouths on the subject of baptism having been practised by the Jews of old, and to convince the court that none of the washings which made a part of the ceremonial law could be the baptism of the whole body, instituted at the beginning of the gospel.

The desire to withhold the whole truth soon discovers itself, by its contradictory statements. You have heard, gentlemen, the circuitous evidence of the Sixth Witness, who affirmed that, from the plain statements of the scripture, baptism was performed by sprinkling or pouring, still that he would admit immersion to be valid baptism, although not according to apostolic baptism; notwithstanding, said he, if a person had been immersed, he should not think it necessary to administer it again by affusion or sprinkling; thus allowing in act, what he endeavours to deny in words. But acts speak louder than words; and after these admissions, no sophistry can obliterate from your minds the impression that he believes being put under water

* On Lev. xvi. 23, 25. † Ibid. 26—28.

is scriptural baptism, or how could it be valid baptism? Add to which, gentlemen, his admission that pedobaptists do not deny that the verb Βαπτω and Βαπτιζω signify to dip or immerse. If, then, gentlemen, the words have this signification when used by profane writers, how does it happen that they have not the same signification when used by the sacred penmen? We affirm, and even upon the authority of some of the witnesses for the plaintiffs, that they always mean to immerse, when used in the scriptures in a literal, and not in a symbolical sense. What said the Seventh Witness, in his cross-examination? Why, that the primary meaning of the words are, "I plunge, or sink completely under water;" and the symbolical meaning, "I oppress, or overwhelm, by bringing afflictions or distress upon."

Moses, gentlemen, was commanded "to make all things according to the pattern shown him on the mount."* "The ordinance of baptism was instituted by God, and the pattern of its administration shown in the person of his well-beloved Son, who, before he went down into the water, declared emphatically, "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."† And while he was ascending out of the water, he was, by a voice from heaven, made manifest to Israel. And yet, the pattern of this ordinance, which is figurative of more excellent glory than were any of the things appertaining to the tabernacle, is, in the eyes of the Sixth Witness, "of inferior importance." Gentlemen, contrast his wavering manner of speaking on this subject, with his bold, confident, becoming, and christian-like manner of speaking on another subject, in another place. "What," says he, "is it of no moment whether a thing be done in Christ's way, or in ours? Surely if the Head of the church has not only commanded the thing to be done, but has pointed out the way of doing it, his way must be the best and the only right way...if both by precept and example he has plainly intimated his will, our only business is to follow his prescription. We have no right to change it; none to substitute another for it. We cannot do so without the impious presumption of preferring our own wisdom to that of Christ's"‡ From this contrast, gentlemen, you may safely draw the conclusion, that while on the latter subject he feels the ground under his feet to be firm, in the former he tacitly admits that he is "treading in slippery places."

* Heb. viii. 5. † Matt. iii. 15.

‡ National Church Establishments Examined, fifth thousand, page 23.

The Seventh Witness is persuaded that the word Βαπτιζω has never been properly analyzed, although he himself has published an analysis of it, and admits, and truly, the difficulty of conceiving how so extraordinary a transition should take place, as that of the derivative, pouring out, from the primitive, plunging in. Nevertheless, in order to establish the doctrine of effusion, and in opposition to his own Lexicon, he substitutes the convenient word *pop*, which, he informs you, denotes to sprinkle, to pour, to wash, to dip, to cleanse, and to bespatter; consequently, it will suit all creeds, with this superior advantage in favour of effusion, that the water may not only be popped on the face, but down the throat, as an emblem of giving new life. Again; this Witness would persuade the court that "Independents have not left this ordinance in so vague and ambiguous a condition as Episcopalians and Presbyterians have done." Let us examine this statement. Three of these said Independents have been before you, and the Seventh himself is one of them; and while he asserts that baptism is the pouring out of water on the turned-up face of the baptized;

The Sixth, another, asserts that baptism is performed by sprinkling or pouring; and

The Eighth, who represents eleven of the *elite* of this sect, (the Independents,) asserts that dipping the body under water is not the *only* scriptural way of baptizing.

Now, Gentlemen, notwithstanding this attempted elucidation of the ordinance by these three Independents, we are still left in the dark respecting which, even according to their judgment, is the scriptural manner of administering the ONE baptism. Gentlemen, I appeal to you if it is not the natural operation of these different and conflicting sentiments to generate scepticism? Does it not seem a strange delusion that these learned witnesses argue as if, in a language so copious as the Greek is admitted to be, a word of such mighty importance as that of baptism should have no definite meaning, but that it may be construed to mean anything or nothing?

This Witness, in his cross-examination, casts a doubt on all he had before said, thus making his evidence altogether in our favour; which evidence, gentlemen, coming from such an inveterate opponent, must have weight. He also asserts "that christians are beginning to despair of any results from the existing controversy." But in this he is mistaken; mere professors of religion despair, but christians

"hope to the end." They know that "the Lord God omnipotent reigneth, and that they shall eventually triumph;"* and this, if he had been familiar with the Will, he would have known. For the battle will continue to rage until "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."† Then those who have believed on the Lord, and followed him in all the ordinances of his house, will join and cry Victory, with a voice so loud as to reach the ends of the earth. Even now, he is sensible that the united voices of the antichristian world cannot silence their victorious shouting.

The Fifth Witness, gentlemen, freely acknowledged to you that he had been compelled to give up opinions he had formerly entertained, and that he was ignorant whether he had adopted better. And also, that there was one consideration which furnished him with a satisfactory hope that what he had taught was substantially at least the truth of God, *i. e.*, that it was the same which is found in almost every creed which has gained everywhere the appropriate name of orthodox. This is the thing, gentlemen, that has made him popular; but it is the worst possible evidence of his being learned in the Will that he could have given. For that "which is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of God."‡ "Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it."§ He appears to have no opinion of his own; and why the plaintiffs have brought him across the Atlantic we have yet to discover. Is it not strange that an inhabitant of the United States of America, where the number of Baptists is said to exceed that of any other denomination, should come here to assert that baptism is opposed to every religious feeling?

Gentlemen, I must trespass upon your attention, while I read a few extracts from the book I hold in my hand. It contains matters which it would be well for our countrymen, even for some of those who call themselves baptists, as well as our opponents, carefully to consider.

"There is no doctrine more completely *misunderstood and perverted by all sects* in this country (America), than that respecting baptism. Nearly four-fifths of the children, and two-thirds of the male population are unbaptized, the prevailing theory being, that the signs of regeneration, consisting in certain mental 'experiences,'

* See Isa. xxxiv. 1—8; Rev. xix. 6—21.
† Rev. xi. 15.
‡ Luke xvi. 15.
§ Matt. vii. 14.

as they term them, should precede the rite, which they not even then consider necessary; all that is important in effecting justification, having, according to their principles, already taken place. The Baptists are the most numerous sect in this country by far, and much of the practice I have mentioned is derived from their doctrines, maintaining, that the 'Bible alone' is a sufficient rule of faith and practice."...

"Though everywhere in New England the greatest possible decency and respect, with regard to morals and religion, is still observed, I have no hesitation in saying that I do not think the New Englanders (or indeed the Americans generally, as far as I can judge,) a *religious* people. The assertion I know is paradoxical, but it is nevertheless true; that is, if a strong, an earnest *belief* be a necessary element in a religious character; to me it seems to be its very essence and foundation. I am not now speaking of a belief in *the* truth, but belief in something or anything which is removed from the action of the senses. Now I appeal to any candid American, whether it be not the received doctrine among nine-tenths of his countrymen, that creeds (religious dogmas, as they are called,) are matters of no moment; that so long as a man acts sincerely up to what he believes, he has as good a chance of salvation, for *he is as likely to be right*, as his neighbour; and that morality (so called) is perfectly independent of, and infinitely more important than, religious belief. This is, I say, the avowed doctrine of the great majority now in America; and as long as such is the case, outward morality may indeed prevail to a great extent, (and I freely admit that in no country have I seen more appearance of it than in New England,) under the influence of traditionary habit, enlightened self-interest, and the law of conscience; but there is no *religion*. No man can be said to believe in a religious system, if he believes, at the same time, that another religious system has an equal chance of being true, in the points of difference which exist between them; for all religions profess to be (as to their distinctive tenets.) exclusively true, and propound doctrines to be believed as necessary to salvation; indeed, it is impossible to conceive a religion that should not do so; such a course would not only be shallow and unphilosophical, but self-contradictory and suicidal. This is pre-eminently the case with respect to christianity. The apostolic epistles are filled with passages which, had they been written by a modern theologian, would have been branded as most intolerant and uncharitable. There they stand, however, witnessing

against the indifferentism which I have described; proclaiming that if an angel from heaven preach any other gospel he shall be accursed, and commanding us not even to bid 'God-speed' to any that 'bring not this doctrine.' But this is not all; scepticism with respect to 'peculiar religious opinions' is quite inconsistent with a strong, uncompromising faith in what is supersensual and eternal. The same mind which rejects the evidence of the former, cannot accept cordially, and become fully convinced of, the latter. Men are generally unconscious of this themselves; their consciences tell them they ought to have a religion, and to act by its dictates; and they think they do so, when they are in fact only acting, as any prudent, sensible, long-sighted person would act, if there were no world beyond the grave, and no law revealed from heaven. Self-denial, self-sacrifice, not temporary but permanent; to live and to feel as a stranger and a pilgrim upon earth; and to look upwards and forwards for a reward and a home, these constitute the true tests of religious earnestness; and of these, though I know there is little at home, comparatively little anywhere on earth, I maintain that America presents even fewer symptoms or appearances."*

Allow me, gentlemen, to call your attention to the following sentence from the extract I have just been reading: "The prevailing theory being, that the sign of regeneration, consisting in certain mental experiences, should precede the rite, which they do not even then consider necessary; all that is important in effecting justification having, according to their principles, already taken place." These ideas, I am constrained to observe, are not peculiar to the people of America only; similar ones are held by individuals in this country, *i. e.*, that immediately persons are self-convinced that the Lord has opened their hearts to understand his word, and given them to see that there is salvation for them, they are so transported by this assurance, that they think they stand at once "perfect and complete in all the will of God,"† and imagine that they can with Paul say, "I have a desire to depart, and to be with Christ."‡ But this is only a momentary excitement of the mind, as a deeper searching into the scriptures will convince them; while they will perceive also that this is only the very beginning of their new life; the first drawing towards the kingdom of God, into which they have yet to be inducted, by a public profession of Christ, and by being baptized in water.

* Letters from America, by J. R. Godley, vol. i., pages 102. 124.

† Col. iv. 12. ‡ Phil. i. 23.

Thus figuratively being baptized into his death, and rising again with him to newness of life, they are "freed from sin."* Thus they enter into, and partake of all the privileges and immunities of his church, the only ark of safety.† It is then that they come under discipline. It is then that they take the yoke upon them. It is then that they are to observe all things whatsoever he has commanded.‡ It is then that they are to be "emptied from vessel to vessel;"§ "sanctified, and made meet for the Master's use, and prepared unto every good work."‖ And the longer the christian lives, and the more he examines himself by the word of God, the more will he be convinced how infinitely he falls short of that perfection which is possessed and inculcated by his great Pattern, the Lord of life and glory; and that the perfection attributed to him is alone through the comeliness put upon him by the Lord his God.¶

Gentlemen, I consider that to be a poor cause, which has to be supported by deviations from general precepts; and it is very clear that if the Eighth Witness could have adduced anything better in support of his principles, he would have adduced it. Equally clear is it, that if he had understood the Will, he would not have denominated the observance of the ordinance of baptism a trivial circumstance; and thus reject the counsel of God against himself.** Neither would he have said that baptism was unquestionably a divine institution ages before the appearance of John. Is it not evident that it was at "the beginning of the gospel,"†† instituted by God, and for the purpose of manifesting his well-beloved Son?‡‡ And is not this proved by our Lord's question to the chief priests and scribes, recorded in Luke xx. 4, 5?

Gentlemen, "when commands are absolute, discretion is forbidden." Of this I shall hereafter give you positive proof. Why, I would ask, is the dreadful curse pronounced upon the inhabitants of the earth, as in Isa. xxiv. 5? Is it not "because they have transgressed the laws, *changed* the ordinance, broken the everlasting covenant"? Does not this show, that to change the ordidinance, is a far greater sin than to reject it? "He (says the Testator,) that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me."§§ And yet this Witness, who rejects his commands, as being odd, hazardous, and troublesome, has the hardihood

* Rom. vi. 3—7. † Acts ii. 47. ‡ Matt. xxviii. 20.
§ Jer. xlviii. 11. ‖ 2 Tim. ii. 21. ¶ Ezek. xvi. 14.
** Luke vii. 30. †† Mark i. 1. ‡‡ John i. 6. 31. §§ John xiv. 21.

to call him "*our* Divine Legislator." I would recommend him and his constituents to study Luke vi. 46—49, and Prov. xxviii. 9. If this Witness does not believe in his heart that immersion is the scriptural and apostolical initiatory ordinance by which believers are introduced into the church, why does he not in a manly manner avow his sentiments at once, and not trouble himself to convince the court that it may be very lawfully and properly exchanged for sprinkling or pouring? Or why does he say, that if the word Βαπτιζω will at all admit,—mark these words, gentlemen, WILL AT ALL ADMIT,—then it is perfectly agreeable to the analogy of scripture to administer the baptismal water by sprinkling or pouring? And why do we hear of these doleful lamentations among the "pious" but weak part of his community? Why, when they hear it constantly affirmed that they are as really unbaptized as Pagans and Turks, are they disturbed and distressed? Is it not because all his sophistical arguments fail to remove their scruples?

He speaks of the Testator as binding down his followers to the Jewish form of baptizing. But, gentlemen, the true followers of the Lord do not look upon baptism as an Old Testament institution; neither do they regard it as a yoke, but as a simple ordinance, by which they are privileged to confess his name, and in which they glory. It is only his rebellious subjects, who kick against his authority, that think a strict adherence to his institution "repugnant to that mild spirit which his religion everywhere breathes;"—they would be saved, not according to his way, but according to their own. "Evil men understand not judgment."* "He that speaketh of himself, seeketh his own glory."†

Again; he says the *whole learned world*, an anti-pedobaptist or two *perhaps* excepted, has acknowledged that the word Βαπτιζω signifies an application of water by sprinkling or pouring. Why, gentlemen, is not the very contrary the fact? Have not the representatives of all the learned men in the kingdom, in parliament assembled, with the lords spiritual and temporal, together with the then reigning king, proclaimed that it signifies to dip the body in water?

Could you have supposed, gentlemen, if you had not heard it, that the latter part of the evidence of the Ninth Witness, directly opposed as it is to the former part, could proceed from the same individual;—the first part highly extolling the scriptures, declaring that the will of God is the only rule to man; that "it admits no

* Prov. xxviii. 5. † John vii. 18.

exceptions in obedience, but requires it *whole* and *entire*:" the latter, depreciating the ordinance which that Will requires, denominating it a comparative trifle, an indecent practice, a superstitious act; thus daring to impugn that ordinance respecting which the Saviour of the world declared, "He that believeth, *and is baptized*, shall be saved." And what support has he for this impious language? probabilities and improbabilities only! thus proving that he himself needs yet to be taught "the first principles of the doctrine of Christ." No, gentlemen, we must reason not from probabilities or improbabilities, but from gospel facts. And were it even conceded that in the second century baptism was superstitiously attended to by the ungodly, surely that is no valid reason why, in the nineteenth century, the godly should not attend to it after the example of the Testator and his immediate disciples.

Gentlemen, may we not apply to this Witness and his fellows, the remarks of a very learned man,* that the generality of "people are born to their opinions, and never question the truth of what their party profess. They clothe their minds as they do their bodies, after the fashion in vogue; not one of a hundred ever examine their principles."

Nevertheless, this Witness, notwithstanding his objections to the truth, must have some qualms of conscience, or he would not complain of the advocates of immersion being "often very troublesome." Neither would he, twice over, have remarked, that "even if immersion was the original mode," it might be changed, without vitiating the ordinance. Neither, when he was depreciating it, would he so warily have expressed himself as to say, that "fatal effects do *sometimes* occur," and that "there is not *perhaps* a female who submits to it who has not previously a great struggle with her delicacy." He says, it is not probable that if immersion were the only allowable mode of baptism, it should not have been expressly enjoined. Why, gentlemen, it was not only expressly enjoined by the Testator himself,† but he "left us an example that we should follow his steps."‡ and being expressly enjoined, does it not prove that he used the word baptize because, in the sense in which he used it, it is univocal?

Gentlemen, no one at all familiar with the spirit of the gospel would have asserted that a female, who has "been taught by him (Christ) as the truth is in Jesus,"§ has any struggle with her delicacy in rendering obedience to the commands of her Lord? No!

* Dr. Watts.

† Matt. xxviii. 19.

‡ 1 Pet. ii. 28. See also Matt. iii. 13—15.

§ Eph. iv. 21.

this is her heart's desire, to *obey* him in all things; and none but those who are ignorant of the joys attending a believer's confession, would have hazarded such an assertion. And if fatal effects *do sometimes* occur, what are the consequences? To the believer, eternal glory! But, gentlemen, I have never heard of a single instance; yet, were they occasionally to occur, the fear of death ought not,* and would not, prevent her from confessing, in the ordinance of baptism, her Saviour's name. Taught by the Testator that his disciples shall be afflicted, and hated of all nations, and even exposed to death itself, for his sake,† they cheerfully bow to all his gracious will.

I once knew a female whose face was so disfigured by disease, that scarcely a former feature of it could be recognized, but whose heart (after she had diligently searched the scriptures for some years when in better health,) had been opened by the Lord. Although informed by her medical attendant that he could not be answerable for the consequences, she resolved to be baptized, and was baptized, without sustaining injury, and for nearly two years afterwards went on her way rejoicing. But even had she died at the time, or immediately after, her death would have been to her gain, and not loss; she would not only have been mercifully saved from all her after sufferings, but would have entered at once into her rest.‡ And if the world had demanded an inquest, what could have been the verdict, but that her death had *apparently* been hastened by obeying the command of her Lord? And would not this accord with what this Witness has said—that the will of God does not accommodate itself to the safety of man, and that life itself should be surrendered rather than that will should be violated?

With a view to the recovery of lost health, what man of the world is there, or what female even, who would not gladly consent to be plunged in cold water every day, if by so doing a reasonable expectation could be cherished that it would restore to the individual the ultimate enjoyment of the blessing? Gentlemen, how many experiments, previously untried, are made in desperate cases; and though many die under the operations, they are nevertheless all sanctioned both by public opinion and by the law of the land. A retired manufacturer, who resided in the neighbourhood of Stockport, once informed me, that in consequence of exposure to draughts and cold, while superintending the building of a new dwelling for himself, he was brought to the very verge of death, so that he could neither

* Luke xiv. 26. † Matt. xxiv. 9. ‡ Matt. xix. 27. 29.

move hand nor foot. In this state, his medical advisers informed him, that they knew of no other way of preserving his life but by having him conveyed to Buxton, and, when there, of *throwing* him into the bath. The result might be fatal, yet there was every probability that it would secure the object desired; while, neglecting the only means which promised a cure, he must inevitably perish. He consented, and recovered! Had he died, would not the people have said, Ah, poor fellow, his was a desperate case, and therefore required a desperate remedy? How many much slighter cases than this have been thought sufficient to justify an evasion of the Saviour's command! yet if death were to ensue after baptism, who is there that would not cry shame? But, gentlemen, I put it to your own good sense to say, whether the uncertain prolongation for a few years of a painful life, is not a poor exchange for the certain and immediate entrance into a state of eternal felicity and bliss? See the Testator's remark on a similar subject, Mark ix. 43. 50.

In a case of less importance than the one at issue, the various and ofttimes conflicting sentiments of the Witnesses would be amusing.

One of them asserts that "baptism was unquestionably a divine institution ages before the time of the Testator."

Another, that "John's baptism was in several respects a new thing in Judæa."

One holds, that "that it became customary, *by degrees*, to baptize all proselytes."

Another, that "God was pleased to institute a *new* ceremony, whereby men at large were to be admitted into his covenant; for which purpose Christ adopted baptism, which had been *consecrated by his brethren after the flesh* to a similar use; and that when Christ used the text John iii. 3, he was alluding by anticipation to the sacrament of baptism which he intended to ordain." What is all this contrariety of opinions, gentlemen, "but confusion doubly confused?"

The first account we read of the institution of baptism is in the Evangelists. Luke says, "The word of God came unto John, the son of Zecharias, in the wilderness, and he came into all the country round about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."* Again he says, "when John had first preached before his (Christ's) coming, the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel."† Now, gentlemen, if the Plaintiffs can point out a single

* Luke iii. 2, 3. † Acts xiii. 24.

clause in the Will where any the most distant allusion is made to the baptism of a proselyte by divine command, previously to the coming of our Lord, I am willing to submit to a verdict in their behalf. It may be truly said of the Plaintiffs' case, in the words of the Sixth Witness on the subject of establishments; "There must be unsoundness in the whole theory, where there are such differences amongst its advocates as to so essential a point—a point affecting the very basis on which the whole, had it any basis at all, must rest."

It is unnecessary for me, gentlemen, to appeal to the learned of the present day as to what is the precise and literal meaning of the verb Βαπτιζω. It is sufficient for my purpose to call your attention to the "Ministration of Public Baptism to be used in the Church of England," as it now stands in the "Book of Common Prayer," a book which was revised and reformed, at four different periods, by the most learned pedobaptists of the day,—by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, and Ministers of State; and it is particularly mentioned, that in the reign of Edward the Sixth, it was ordered by a statute in Parliament, that it should be faithfully and godlily perused, explained, and *made perfect.* Yet the office of public baptism, which peremptorily requires the priest to *dip* the child (if it can endure it,) remained untouched. A convincing proof that all the learned men who revised the Prayer-book attached the same meaning to the verb Βαπτιζω as those did who first translated it, *i. e.*, that it meant to put the whole body under water.

But this is not all, gentlemen; this same Prayer-book, in which the word Βαπτιζω is translated to dip, passed both houses of convocation, was subscribed by the bishops and clergy, was ratified by act of parliament, and received the royal assent. Here, gentlemen, we have the King, Lords, and Commons, with the Bishops and Clergy, openly acknowledging that to dip is the primary meaning of the word. Yet mark the inconsistency of our opponents. They revile us in every possible way, and bring us into this court, because we act upon their own translation, *to which translation the majority of them to this day subscribe;* while the clergy bind themselves to administer the ordinance accordingly. Can any benefit, gentlemen, be reasonably expected to accrue to man, from a church, the rulers of which require their subordinates to subscribe to all the book contains; who make them declare, and seal their declaration with the Lord's supper, that they are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to

take upon themselves the office of minister, and yet permit, and have for ages permitted, these very men, not only to violate what the church avows to be the will of God, but to violate their own engagements, by sprinkling children, instead of dipping them.

It may be replied, that only a part of our opponents subscribe to the Prayer-book. True, gentlemen! but it must be allowed that by far the greatest part do, and that the others are the offspring of the parent church, who, like her, continue to christen infants, and perpetuate that error, which, as regards the worship of God, is the foundation of every other. You yourselves have heard the admission, in this court, by the leading men of the various denominations, that being put under water is scriptural baptism, or that it answered every purpose for whch it was ordained by the Testator. Therefore, gentlemen, you cannot err in giving us your verdict as to the meaning of the word Βαπτιζω; for, in addition to what I have just said, not only do the majority of the people of England acknowledge the book in which the word is translated to dip to be the standard of pure worship, but that its meaning in the Will is determined by the prominent manner in which it stands in a number of passages, where it is used to express the initiatory ordinance of the New Testament. In all legal documents, each word is taken according to its simple, grammatical meaning, unless otherwise declared by its connexion. And why should not our English translation of the Will be taken in the same manner? It was the work of pedobaptists, who could have no bias to translate or transfer words in such a manner as to be hostile to their own opinions and practices, and favour those who differed from them. We must therefore consider, gentlemen, that all the attempts of our opponents to assign to particular words a meaning different from that which we insist they bear in the English text, are feeble efforts to support a tottering cause. Had the translation from the original tongues been confided to the care of such men as these Witnesses, wholly under the influence of prejudice, (if we may judge from the specimens we have heard, and their well known determined *opposition* to the translation of the word Βαπτιζω,) they would have so corrupted it that the unlearned, or those who are ignorant of Greek, could not, from such a translation as we should then have had, have been able to arrive at a correct understanding of what so nearly concerns them. But it was the will of the "Father of mercies" that his people should have the scriptures handed down to them pure and unalloyed. For

which purpose he so ordered it that a company of upright men should be appointed to accomplish the work, who have faithfully performed the task assigned to them, and left us a translation which has stood the test of centuries. True, it has been assailed by enemies of every grade and description, for upwards of two hundred years; notwithstanding which, no proofs of incompetency, or inaccuracy, or partiality to any sect or creed, can, with any show of justice, in any matter of the slightest importance, be alleged against either it or them. Hence appeals made to the original text, which the unlearned do not understand, serve only to show that the Plaintiffs cannot, according to the authorised translation, establish their claim.

Gentlemen, you have heard it stated by several of the Witnesses, that the ordinance of the Testator may be changed, and ought to be changed, according to circumstances, with a view to accommodate it to the various manners and customs of different parts of the earth; and that even if it were not to be questioned (and they appear to feel it cannot be,) that immersion universally prevailed at the introduction of christianity, we who live in this refined and enlightened age are not to be governed by the customs of those remote times; that we are not only justified in making, but are called upon to make, such changes in the ordinance of the Testator as are accordant with our ideas of delicacy, modesty, and propriety; as well as to consult the ease, the comfort, the health, and the convenience of all parties concerned. Now I ask, Is not this tantamount to calling in question the wisdom, prescience, and goodness of the Lord, who, "declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done, saying, My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure"?* And, while it publishes their wisdom and prudence to be superior to his, is it not an indirect avowal also that the meaning of the word baptize is immerse?

Gentlemen, I shall here trespass upon your time, while I read an extract from a work recently written by a Vicar of the Church of England; part of which, particularly as coming from an opponent, is well worthy of your attention, as it shows how and when, in this country, sprinkling became substituted for immersion. And as it shows also that the ministers of the Establishment are beginning to discover that they are not acting in accordance with their own rubrics, let us hope, gentlemen, that this is not only a prelude to

* Isa. xlvi. 10.

the discovery that, even if they were so acting, they would not be acting in accordance with the Will, but that they may soon be led to see their error, and seeing it, that they may have the courage at once to acknowledge it, and refrain from longer prostituting the holy ordinance of the Testator, by applying it either to infants or to unbelievers.

"My object," says the writer, "is to restore this act of consecration (baptism,) to its original design — to render it a solemn and sacred dedication to God.*...It has been very generally considered, within the last three hundred years, that it makes no difference whether it be done by sprinkling or effusion, or washing the body in pure water....Nor is the washing of the body in pure water a point of mere indifference. The form and mode of initiation into the Church of Christ are, in their consequences, of high and solemn importance....In regard to baptism, the outward and visible sign becomes an integral part of the ordinance itself....The custom of the primitive church gives no sanction to baptism by effusion or sprinkling, except in cases of necessity....In the reign of Elizabeth, immersion came by degrees into disuse,...and Calvin directs that the minister should pour water upon the infant; and this was the first public form of baptism which prescribed effusion....The Salisbury Missal, printed in 1530, expressly requires...and orders dipping. And in the first Common Prayer-book of Edward the Sixth, the general order is to dip the child in the water;...the rubric only allowing, if it be weak, then it shall suffice to pour water upon it.... However, it being allowed to weak children, many fond ladies at first, and then by degrees the common people, would persuade the minister that their children were too tender for dipping. But what principally tended to confirm the practice was, that several of our English divines, flying into Germany and Switzerland, during the bloody reign of queen Mary, and returning home when Elizabeth came to the throne, brought back with them a great love and zeal to the customs of those Protestant churches beyond sea....They thought they could not do the Church of England a greater service than to introduce a practice sanctioned by so great an oracle as Calvin....Afterwards, when the directory was put out by the Parliament, effusion began to have a show of establishment, it being declared not only lawful, but sufficient, and most expedient, that children should be baptized by pouring or sprinkling of water on

* Page 143.

their face. And, as it were for the further prevention of immersion, or dipping, it was particularly provided that baptism should not be administered in places where fonts, in the time of popery, were unfitly and superstitiously placed; and accordingly...they changed the font into a basin, which, being brought to the minister in his reading-desk, and the child being below him, he dipped in his fingers, and so took up water enough just to let a drop or two fall on the child's face. Our divines, at the Restoration, understanding a little better the sense of scripture and antiquity, again restored the order for immersion....

"The very word baptize properly means, to wash a person in water, by dipping or immersion. It is evident it was by this mode that John the Baptist baptized all who came to him; and that their bodies were washed with water. There can be no question but that John himself, and those that were baptized of him, went into the water, and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. And it is said of Jesus, when he was baptized, that 'he went up straightway out of the water.' 'John also was baptizing in Ænon, because there was much water there.'...We cannot but infer that in these cases their bodies were actually washed with pure water; and we find that the same mode of admitting new converts into the covenant of grace was continued. The word baptism has, no doubt, sometimes figuratively another meaning; but as to the admission into the church, it implies that the body was washed with water. It was in this manner that the eunuch was baptized....It has been contended, in opposition to all authority in the early church on this point, that no particular direction being given in scripture concerning the manner in which water is to be applied in baptism, we may allow immersion, effusion, or aspersion to be equally valid. Such observations have been made more to confirm a custom that has unwarily crept into the church, than to maintain the truth itself. But this is not the way to preserve the church in its primitive and pure state. To keep it pure, we must appeal 'to the law and to the testimony.'...There can be no doubt that the word baptize implies more than affusion or sprinkling, and that it means to wash or bathe....Nor is such baptism to be considered a mere point of indifference. There is great reason to infer that the ordinance of baptism, in latter times, has been greatly degraded, in many churches, especially in the Church of England, (in opposition to the rubrics of that church,) from the very circumstance of sprinkling

being so commonly received; and from this circumstance, also, it has lost much of its solemnity as a sacrament of Christ....

"It is but too evident that the mode of baptism by sprinkling has in fact degenerated to a 'mere form of godliness, without the power thereof.' In all ordinary cases,... although in point of fact we know the practice is widely different, it presumes that the child is baptized by immersion....In point of fact it is generally allowed, by all who have attended to the question, that immersion, or washing of the body in pure water, was in all ordinary cases the received mode of christian baptism in the primitive church....They (the fathers,) speak of 'the immersion in water as a descent into the grave, and the rising again out of the water as a resurrection from the dead.' They refer to the words of the apostle, Rom. vi. 3—6, and Col. ii. 12....There is another point in respect to baptism, which, though not essential to it as a christian sacrament, yet is of very high moment as to its solemnity—that it be ministered in public. The Church of Christ has observed it from the beginning as a public act."*

Thus, gentlemen, has it been widely and truly proclaimed, by a minister of the Establishment, that the ordinance of baptism has been greatly *degraded, especially by the Church of England.* But, gentlemen, if the reverend writer had delayed his publication a little, he might have given so signal a proof of it, that no good churchman could have denied the fact. I refer to the christening of the wife of the Michigan chief, Mah Coonse, who died at *Lambeth*, and who, according to the newspapers of the day, "was received into the Christian Church, January 22, 1835, a few hours before her death, by the name of Antoine O Whow O Qua." Such of you, gentlemen, as may not have heard of this circumstance, will naturally presume that she was christened, according to the 27th Article, as "a sign of regeneration, or new birth;" and you will therefore be surprised (if any act of the Church can surprise you,) to hear that she was not only not so christened, but that she was christened in consequence of the apprehension of the chief, her husband, that if the ceremony were to be omitted, she could not be interred in the church-yard, as became her station in life, and as a dear sister. Contrast, gentlemen, the conduct of this poor, ignorant, superstitious creature, with that of the clergyman who officiated at her christening. She, a

* Baptism Considered, by the Rev. T. H. Kingdon, B. D., Vicar of Bridgerule, Devon, pages 121—139.

pagan, chose to die rather than offend (as she thought,) the Great Spirit, by taking medicine, with the intention of evading the summons. He, calling himself a christian minister, preferred transgressing the law of his church, by which he had sworn to be guided, rather than the pride of an Indian chief should be offended! The law runs as follows: "When any such persons as are of riper years are to be baptized, timely notice shall be given to the bishop, or whom he shall appoint for that purpose, a week before, *at the least*, by the parents or some other discreet persons; that so due care may be taken for their examination, whether they be sufficiently instructed into the principles of the christian religion; and that they may be exhorted to prepare themselves, with prayers and fasting, for the receiving of this holy sacrament."

On this the Record Newspaper, (the acknowledged organ of what is called the evangelical church party,) of the 12th of February, 1835, makes the following remark: "But if the case were one of such extremity that a week's notice was impossible,—and this is a circumstance not provided for by the rubric,—did the poor Indian express desire to be admitted into the Christian Church? Did she answer the questions appointed to be asked? Or was not the ceremony merely intended as a passport to what is called christian burial, in consecrated ground? We (says the Record,) think this subject ought not to pass without enquiry; if our bishops and clergy would guard the rites of the church against profanation, and if they would not sanction the pernicious and soul-destroying figment, that any mere external ordinance can make a man a christian."

Gentlemen, in the decision to which you may come in this momentous enquiry, it behoves you to divest your minds of all consideration of consequences to the Plaintiffs; and of how that decision may affect the memory of the three eminent characters mentioned by the Tenth Witness. You must beware of being carried away, as was Barnabas,* by dissimulation; you must "judge righteous judgment." Nor must you suffer your minds to be warped by the statements of men, no matter how estimable they may have been in the eyes of the world; for should such men be able to make an undue impression, I should fear for you, because all the Witnesses are as eminent in their way as the three individuals mentioned.

The First Witness has written a Commentary upon the Old and New Testaments, and is reckoned among the most learned of the day.

* Gal. ii. 13.

The Second has written a Commentary on the Gospel, which is highly approved.

The Third stands high in the Establishment, is chaplain to the first dignitary in the realm, and is looking for a mitre. He also has written a commentary on the Bible, and two tracts on Regeneration and Conversion.

The Fourth has also written a Commentary on the Bible, which some say has had a greater sale than any work of the kind that has been published in this country. He has also published a small work entitled "The Force of Truth."

The Fifth is a foreigner of great note, President of Yale College, (United States.) "In theology and ethics, in natural philosophy and geography, in history and statistics, in poetry and philology, in husbandry and domestic economy, his treasures are equally inexhaustible."* He has published one hundred and seventy-three sermons, which have been republished in this country, and are greatly esteemed for their *orthodoxy*.

The Sixth has published "A Dissertation on Infant Baptism," and several other works. He is much esteemed in England as well as in Scotland, both as a preacher and writer, and has recently greatly distinguished himself by lecturing against the Establishment.

The Seventh has published an "Essay on Baptism," a Greek Grammar, and a Greek and English Lexicon.

The Eighth has written "Dissertations on Christian Baptism, showing Anti-pedobaptism to be in opposition to the Holy Scriptures." As you have heard, he has been deputed to this court by eleven of the most popular congregational preachers and writers of the day; and as he has already given a full account of himself, it is unnecessary for me to repeat it.

The Ninth I have understood to be the best orator in his denomination; he has published a work entitled "Theological Institutes."

The Tenth also is an eminent man, being one of the three Witnesses who has had conferred upon him the honorary distinction of D. D. He also has written on the ordinance of baptism. But, gentlemen, you have already had a specimen of the truth of what is written,† "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent."

At this stage of the enquiry, gentlemen, I deem it right to bring before you a few examples from the Will, illustrative of the tremen-

* His Life, page 47. † 1 Cor. i. 19.

dous consequences of departing from the commands and institutions of God.—Adam was forbidden to eat of the fruit of one particular tree; what less could have been required, to leave him a free agent? He transgressed, and brought death upon himself and all his progeny. We must presume that Cain, equally with Abel, knew the will of God, and the method of acceptable approach to him by sacrifice; for he said unto him, "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at thy door."* Yet Cain, knowing this, did not, after the manner of Abel, bring of the firstlings of his flock, and offer them, in faith of the one great sacrifice that was, in the course of time, to be made for the sins of the whole world.† Therefore, to Cain and his offering the Lord had no respect.

The antediluvians had a revelation from God, and must have known his will; for Enoch walked with God upwards of three hundred years; and his translation was a manifest proof that he was a believer. Yet in process of time the people became so corrupted, that the Lord said to Noah, "Thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation;‡ intimating that he was the *only* one. Noah, for a hundred and twenty years, warned the people of what would be the consequence of their rebellion; but in vain; none would hearken to him. When, therefore, their iniquity was full, the whole race of man, save eight persons, were destroyed. Yet, with this awful example before their eyes, the majority of the present world are, by "walking after their own devices,"§ subjecting themselves to a dispensation equally awful.

From four to five hundred years after the flood, we find some of Noah's descendants living in the same open rebellion against God as the antediluvians had lived; so that in the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim, there was found only one righteous person. The consequence was, that the guilty cities were totally destroyed, with all their inhabitants, except Lot, the one righteous person, his wife, and two daughters; whilst Lot's wife, contrary to the commandment, looking back, perished for her disobedience.‖

Moses, the man of God, "spoke unadvisedly with his lips," at the waters of Meribah; and because he believed not God, to sanctify him in the eyes of the children of Israel, he was not permitted to bring them into the promised land.¶ The sentence passed upon

* Gen. iv. 7. † Heb. xi. 4. ‡ Gen. vii. 1.
§ Jer. xviii. 12. ‖ Gen. xix. 26. ¶ Num. xx. 12.

Moses afforded a striking example to the people that God is no respecter of persons; and that no one, no, not even his distinguished and highly favoured minister, should with impunity deviate, in the slightest degree, from a positive command. When the law was given from Mount Sinai, it was said to the people, "If thou wilt make me an altar of stone, thou shalt not build it of hewn stone; for if thou lift up thy tool upon it, thou hast polluted it."* This command will apply to every thing that regards the worship of God; whatever we add to, or take from, his word, is nothing more nor less than lifting up a tool to pollute it.

Aaron and his sons were taken from among the children of Israel, to minister unto the Lord in the priest's office; but Aaron only was permitted to burn incense on the altar, on which no strange fire was to be offered. And Nadab and Abihu, daring to transgress the divine injunction, "which he commanded them not,"† were in consequence consumed. Attend, gentlemen, to what Moses said to the Jews; "Hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes and to the judgments which I teach you, for to do them; that ye may live. Ye shall not *add* unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye *diminish* ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God."‡

A prophet, denominated "a man of God," while on an errand, was commanded to eat no bread, nor drink water, nor turn again by the same way that he came,—things in themselves, at any other time, *absolutely indifferent*. The command was to him, during that time, a positive precept; but he followed the counsel of his fellow-man, in opposition to the direct commandment of God. And the consequence was, that "after he had eaten bread and drank water, a lion met him in the way, and slew him."§

It was told the people of Israel that when Jericho should be delivered into their hands, all the silver and gold that was found there should be brought into the treasury of the Lord; but Achan took of the accursed thing, and secreted two hundred shekels of silver, and a wedge of gold, "for which all Israel was troubled, and they stoned him with stones."‖

The destruction of Uzza, and 50,070 men, the former for his apparently laudable intention of preventing an accident to the ark, the latter for looking into it, furnishes an impressive example of the

* Exod. xx. 25. † Lev. x. 1. ‡ Deut. iv. 1, 2.
§ 1 Kings xiii. ‖ Josh. vi. vii. chapters.

Lord's jealousy of his prerogative. Having given the ark to the care of the priests, none else might dare to touch it; no, not even to preserve it from apprehended destruction. Thus were these men made examples to succeeding generations of the danger of infringing in any manner the divine commands.* And why did the Lord make a breach upon Israel, at the removing of the ark from the house of Obededom? was it not because they "*sought him not after the due order*"?†

When Saul, impatient for the coming of Samuel, took upon himself the office of priest, and offered the burnt-offering, Samuel said unto him, "Thou hast done foolishly; thou hast not kept the commandment of the Lord thy God, which he commanded thee;" therefore "thy kingdom shall not continue."‡ And when this same Saul was sent to smite Amalek, he executed the commandment in part only; yet, in the vanity of his mind, he said to Samuel, "I have performed the commandment of the Lord. What meaneth, then, (replied the latter,) this bleating of sheep in mine ears, and the lowing of oxen which I hear?" Saul said, "The people spared the best of the sheep and the oxen, to sacrifice unto the Lord thy God." Samuel, to show the sinfulness of disobedience, even though it might have been occasioned by a mistaken view of pleasing God, replied, "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry. Because thou hast rejected the word of the Lord, he hath rejected thee from being king."§

There are also circumstances left on record under the old dispensation, as admonitions to us who live under the new, that no length of time can weaken, or vary, or justify the neglect or disuse of, the institutions of God. For example; for nearly a thousand years the Jews had neglected to keep the feast of tabernacles, according to the commandments of God. But when they returned from Babylon, where they had been driven captive for their sins, "they made booths, and sat under the booths; for since the days of Joshua the son of Nun unto that day had not the children of Israel done so."‖

Again, "Shaphan the scribe showed the king, saying, Hilkiah the priest hath delivered me a book. And Shaphan read it before the king. And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of

* 1 Sam. vi. 19; 2 Sam. vi. 6, 7. † 1 Chron. xv. 13.
‡ 1 Sam. xiii. 11—14. § 1 Sam. xv. ‖ Neh. viii. 17.

the book of the law, that he rent his clothes."*..."And he put down the idolatrous priests whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places of the cities of Judah, and in the high places round about Jerusalem; those also that burnt incense unto Baal, to the sun, and to the moon, and to the planets, and to all the host of heaven....And all the houses also of the high places that were in the cities of Samaria, which the kings of Israel had made, to provoke the Lord to anger, Josiah took away....And the king commanded all the people, saying, Keep the passover unto the Lord your God, *as it is written in the book of the covenant.*"†

And again; Hezekiah, "in the first year of his reign, opened the doors of the house of the Lord, and repaired them...and said, Hear me, ye Levites, sanctify now yourselves, and sanctify the house of the Lord God of your fathers, and carry forth the filthiness out of the holy place. For our fathers have trespassed, and done that which was evil in the eyes of the Lord our God; and have forsaken him, and have turned away their faces from the habitation of the Lord, and turned their backs. Also, they have shut up the doors of the porch, and put out the lamps, and have not burned incense, nor offered burnt-offerings in the holy place unto the God of Israel. Wherefore the wrath of the Lord is upon Judah and Jerusalem, and he hath delivered them to trouble, to astonishment, and hissing.'‡

Here are three remarkable instances of the Jews, as a nation, neglecting, for hundreds of years, to keep the feasts and attend to the temple worship, according to the commandments of God, and afterwards returning to their original observance. To which may be added another instance, wherein the just judgment of God proportioned the duration of their captivity to the number of periods that they had disregarded a particular precept. They had, without intermission, for four hundred and ninety years sown their fields, pruned their vineyards, and gathered in the fruit thereof; during a seventh part of which time they had, contrary to the express command of God, deprived the land of its rest. They were therefore driven from it, "until the land had enjoyed her sabbath; for as long as she lay desolate she kept sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years."§

The signal punishments from time to time inflicted on the descendants of Jacob ought to be a warning to those who disregard the commandments of God, and who change the ordinances that he

* 2 Kings xxii. 10, 11.
† 2 Kings xxiii. 5. 19. 21.
‡ 2 Chron. xxix. 3. 5—8.
§ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.

has appointed. What if the ordinance of baptism has been profaned or disregarded for nearly seventeen hundred years, can that circumstance detract from the importance of its correct observance, or afford any plea for longer profaning it? No, gentlemen, the Jews, as you all know, are living witnesses of God's jealousy for his institutions. For their disregard of them, they are to this day "delivered to trouble, to astonishment, and hissing." They were blinded, and kept in ignorance of the law, by their priests, who substituted traditionary legends for the written law of God. So the people of this country, to the present day, with all their boasted independence and knowledge, suffer themselves to be blinded and kept in darkness by their priests, who substitute for the gospel "scattered fragments" of tradition, handed down from the ancients, and persuade them that "the Will is not an all-sufficient guide;" that "they ought to acquiesce in such rules as are recommended to them by long practice, and that are established by those who have the lawful charge over them." Would it not be their wisdom, gentlemen, to speak to their ministers that they follow the example of Nehemiah, the priests, and the levites,* after their return from Babylon, by reading out of the Gospel, and teaching them to abide by such ordinances only as are in accordance both with the Testator's command and his example? O that they would keep constantly before their eyes the last clause in the Will—"If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book." And that, above all, they would never forget the declaration of the Testator, "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."† Together with the saying of Elijah, which is not less appropriate to the present times than it was to the period when it was spoken by the prophet, "If the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him."‡

I have brought before you, gentlemen, some of the awful but instructive punishments with which the Israelites have been visited on account of "transgressing the laws, changing the ordinance, and breaking the everlasting covenant," and call upon my learned friend and his witnesses deeply to ponder them. With the prophetic writings before me, I see not how the nations of the present day,

* Neh. viii. 8. † Matt. xv. 9. ‡ 1 Kings xviii. 21.

who are treading in their footsteps, can expect to escape similar punishments.* Nations, as nations, must undergo their punishment in this world,† because they cannot be punished as such in the next. Many of the eastern nations, particularly those which most afflicted the Jews,‡ have been so swept, "with the besom of destruction," that scarcely a vestige of them is discoverable,§ while the few that have still a name as remaining, are utterly debased. And why should not the western nations look for a similar punishment? Indeed, the anger of the Lord has of late been visibly going forth. Contemplate the French Revolution—its butcheries, and the calamities it occasioned all over Europe! Look at Spain, stripped of her colonies, her ships, and her commerce, torn by intestine wars and bloodshed, her wretched inhabitants murdering one another in cold blood! Look at Portugal also, much in the same state as her unhappy neighbour. And what two other European nations have more afflicted the ancient people of God, or practised greater barbarities on their fellow-men? Other illustrations might be given, but let these suffice. Judging after the manner of men, Great Britain may be spared and blessed, while she continues the chosen instrument in the hand of God for distributing the Sacred Scriptures to the ends of the earth. But when that great work shall have been accomplished, so far as her instrumentality may be required, then, if she turn not to the Lord, in deep repentance for her sins, both at home and abroad, she, like the Assyrian of old, after his appointed work was accomplished, may be deserted of him. The records of antiquity shew us that great nations, like great men, have their birth, their youth, their prime, their glory, their decay, and death. Empire is transitory, and who is bold enough to assert that the Atlantic is destined to arrest the progress of this nation to decay.

Finally, gentlemen, there are around us indications of the approach of that time when all the earth shall bow to the institution of the Lord, and confess his name according to it; when there will be no more disputes as to the meaning of the word Βαπτιζω, or whether an infant should be christened; but when the Almighty "will turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, and serve him with one consent."‖

* See Matt. xxiv. 29—30, and Rev. vi. 12—17.

† Gen. xviii. 24—29; Isa. xxxiv.; Isa. lx. 12.; Jer. xii. 17; Jer. xxv. 31—33; Zeph. iii. 8.

‡ Jer. xii. 14; Jer. xxx. 16. § Jer. li. 62—64. ‖ Zeph. iii. 9.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON THE CHRISTENING OF INFANTS, AND HOW FAR THE PRACTICE IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE WILL OF THE TESTATOR.

The First Witness said, "If Christ embraced little children, why should not his church embrace them? Why not dedicate them to God in baptism?...I confess it appears to me grossly heathenish and barbarous to see parents who profess to believe in that Christ who loves children, and among them those whose creed does not prevent them from using infant baptism, depriving their children of an ordinance by which no soul can prove that they cannot be profited; and, through an unaccountable bigotry or carelessness, withhold from them the privilege of even *a nominal dedication* to God; and yet these very persons are ready enough to fly for a minister to baptize their child when they suppose it is at the point of death."*

"To the objection, *It is not commanded to baptize infants, therefore they are not to be baptized*, I answer, *It is not forbidden to baptize infants, therefore they are to be baptized*. And the reason is plain; for when pedobaptism, in the *Jewish* church, was so known in the admission of proselytes, that nothing almost was more known, usual, and frequent, there was no need to strengthen it with any precept, when baptism was now passed into an evangelical sacrament. For Christ took baptism into his hands, and into evangelical use, as he found it, this only added, that he might promote it to a worthier *end*, and a larger use. The whole nation knew well enough that *little children* used to be *baptized;* there was no need of a precept for that which had ever by common use prevailed. For...since it was common in all preceding ages that *little children should be baptized*, if Christ had been minded to have that custom abolished, he could have *openly forbidden it*. Therefore *his silence*, and the silence of the *scripture* in this matter, confirms pedobaptism, and continues it to all ages.†

"It is natural to suppose that *adults* were the first subjects of

* On Mark x. 16. † End of Mark.

baptism; for as the gospel was in a peculiar manner sent to the Gentiles, they must hear and receive it before they could be expected to renounce their old prejudices and idolatries, and come into the bonds of the christian covenant. But certainly no argument can be drawn from this concession against the baptism of *children*...And as to the objection that the baptized were obliged to profess their faith, and that therefore only *adults* should be baptized, there is no weight at all in it, because what is spoken of such refers to those who only at that period of life heard the gospel, and were not born of parents who had been christians; therefore they could not have been baptized into the christian faith, forasmuch as no such faith was at their infancy preached in the world."*...

Cross-examined.—"In John i. 12, 13, we are told, 'As many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe in his name, which were born *not* of blood, *nor* of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' Who were regenerated, not of bloods, the union of father and mother, or of a distinguished or illustrious ancestry; for the Hebrew language makes use of the *plural* to point out the dignity or excellency of a thing. And probably by this the evangelist intended to show his countrymen, that having Abraham and Sarah for their parents would not entitle them to the blessings of the new covenant, as no man could lay claim to them but in consequence of being born of God; therefore neither the *will of the flesh*,—any thing that the corrupt heart of man could propose or determine on its own behalf; nor the *will of man*,—any thing that *another* may be disposed to do in our behalf, can avail here. This new birth must come through the *will of God*, through his own unlimited power and boundless mercy, prescribing salvation by Christ Jesus alone....

"Under the dispensation of the gospel, of which Christ Jesus is head and supreme, neither circumcision,—nothing that the Jew can boast of, nothing that the Gentile can call excellent,—*availeth any thing*, can in the least contribute to the salvation of the soul. But A NEW CREATURE,—*but a new creation*, not a new creature merely, (for this might be restrained to any new power or faculty,) but a total renewal of the whole man,—of all the powers and passions of the soul: and as *creation* could not be effected but by the power of the Almighty, so this change cannot be effected but by the same energy; no circumcision can do this; only the power that made the

* Matt. xxviii. 19.

man at first can *new make him.** As the thorough conversion of the soul is compared to a *new creation*, and *creation* is the proper work of an *All-wise, Almighty Being*, then this total change of heart, soul, and life, which takes place under the preaching of the gospel, is effected by the *power* and *grace* of God; this is *salvation*, and salvation must ever be of the Lord, and therefore men should apply to him who alone can work this wondrous change."†

The Second Witness said, "Baptism, under the New Testament, succeeds circumcision under the Old, and is a rite of initiation to Christians, as circumcision was to the Jews; for the apostle here‡ proves that by virtue of our spiritual circumcision in baptism, we have no need of the outward circumcision of the flesh. Baptism is undoubtedly Christ's ordinance for infants of believing christians, as circumcision was of old for the infants of believing Jews. For if under the gospel infants be not received by some federal rite into the covenant with God, they are in a worse condition than children under the law; and the apostle could not truly have said, 'we were complete in Christ,' *i. e.*, as complete without circumcision as even the Jewish church was with it; if we had not an ordinance, to wit, baptism, as good as their abrogated ordinance of circumcision."§

"All adult and grown persons are to be first taught and instructed, before they be baptized; but it follows not from hence that the children of such parents may not be baptized before they are taught; for the apostles were to baptize all nations, of which children are a chief, if not the chiefest part. Besides, those that were proselyted to the Jewish religion, though, before they were circumcised themselves, they were instructed in the law of God; yet when they were circumcised themselves, their children were not denied circumcision at eight days old. In like manner, we have no reason to deny the children of baptized parents, who are in covenant themselves, the sign and seal of the covenant, which is baptism. God having assured his people that he 'will be the God of them and of their seed.' If this privilege be denied, the children of christian parents are in a worse condition than the children of the Jews, and consequently infants are in a worse condition since Christ's coming than they were before, and the privileges of those that live under the gospel are straiter and narrower than of those that lived under the law.‖ True, indeed, the

* Gal. vi. 15. † On Cor. v. 18. ‡ Col. ii. 12.
§ Testament, page 731. ‖ Ibid., page 109.

Jews did not admit proselytes to circumcision *then*, no more will we adult persons to baptism *now*, without the answer of a good conscience, or a solemn stipulation to be the Lord's for ever; but they admitted infants to circumcision without it; in like manner the Christian Church now admits the children of christian parents to baptism without such answer made by them, but for them only.*... The baptism of repentance (says the learned Dr. Lightfoot,) belongs to children, though they know not what repentance means, because it engages them to repentance when they come to years to understand that engagement."†

Cross-examined.—"The disciples did not call themselves christians first at Antioch, much less did their enemies give them that name; but they had it by divine authority imposed on them. God would have Christ's disciples called christians, 1st, as scholars, who received their denomination from their Master, they are taught to learn of and imitate Christ, whose name they bear; 2d, as the word christian signifies anointed ones, it puts them in mind of their divine unction, which they receive from the Holy One, whereby they are made kings and priests unto God.‡

"It is a vain thing to expect exemption from the judgments of God, because of outward privileges enjoyed by us. If we be not born again of the Spirit, it will avail us nothing to be born of Abraham's flesh; if Abraham's faith be not found in our hearts, it will be no advantage to us that Abraham's blood is running in our veins.§

"Men are very prone to bear up themselves upon the piety of their ancestors, though strangers in practice to their piety; as the Jews boasted they were of the seed of Abraham, but did not the works of Abraham; whereas men are so far from being God's children, because they had godly parents, that Christ told the Jews who came forth out of Abraham's loins, that they were 'of their father the devil.'" John viii. 4.‖

"'Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God....It is here asserted that men become not the children of God by natural propagation, but by spiritual regeneration....grace runs not in the blood, piety is not hereditary. Religious parents propagate corruption, not regeneration. Were the conveyances of grace natural, good parents would not be so ill suited with children as they sometimes are."¶

* Testament, page 198. † Ibid., page 111. ‡ Ibid., page 406.
§ Ibid., page 181. ‖ Ibid., page 513. ¶ Ibid., page 273.

The Fourth Witness said, "When I had published the 'Force of Truth,' I had never attended to any controversies concerning church government, or any kindred subjects....But soon after, the 'controversy concerning baptism, whether it should be administered to infants, or only to adults professing faith,' fell in my way, and for some time I was almost ready to conclude that the anti-pedobaptists were right. This gave me great uneasiness, not because I was solicitous whether, in the search of truth, I were led among them, or elsewhere; but because I feared being misled, and deprecated following my publication with a farther and *needless* change, which might bring discredit upon it. Many, very many prayers, accompanied with tears, did I pour out on this subject. I read books on both sides of the question, but received no satisfaction. I became even afraid of administering baptism, or the Lord's supper. But I said to myself, 'He that believeth shall not make haste;' I must retain my station till I have taken time to examine the subject fully; and I must in the mean time do what retaining that station requires....At length I laid aside all controversial writings, and determined to seek satisfaction on this question, as I had on others, by searching the scriptures and prayer. I was no less time than three quarters of a year engaged in this investigation, before I came to a conclusion; but I was then so fully satisfied that the infant children of believers, and of all who make a credible profession of faith, are the proper subjects of baptism, that I have never since been much troubled about it.

"This was my conclusion, especially from the identity of the covenant made with Abraham, and that still made with believers; and from circumcision being the sacrament of regeneration under the old dispensation, as baptism is under the new, and the seal of the righteousness of faith. Abraham received this seal long after he believed; Isaac, when an infant; Ishmael, when thirteen years of age. The men of Abraham's household, and Esau, though uninterested in the promises concerning Canaan, yet as a part of Abraham's family, and of the visible church, were circumcised by the command of God himself. The circumcision of infants was enjoined, with denunciations of wrath against those who neglected it. The apostles were Israelites, accustomed to this system. Adult Gentiles were admitted among the Jews by circumcision, and their male children were circumcised also....Had only adults been designed to be the subjects of christian baptism, some prohibition of admitting

infants would have been requisite; and we should never have read, as we do, of *households* being baptized, without any limitation or exception of this kind being intimated. In short, unless it can be proved that circumcision is not the sign or sacrament of regeneration, even as baptism now is, I cannot see how the argument can be answered; and all the common objections against infant baptism, as administered to subjects incapable of the professions required and the benefits intended, bear with equal force against infant circumcision. The conclusion thus drawn rests not on this one ground alone; collateral proof was not, and is not, overlooked; but my idea always was, that not the *privilege* of the infant, but the *duty* of the parent, is the grand thing to be ascertained; and this clears away much extraneous matter from the argument."*

Re-examined.—" 'The disciples were called christians first at Antioch.' The word christian aptly denoted their reliance on that anointed Prince and Saviour, who was generally rejected with disdain by Jews and Gentiles. It also implied that they were partakers of an *unction* by the Holy Spirit. Doubtless it was afterward used as a term of reproach by their persecutors...at present it is applied promiscuously to so vast and heterogeneous a multitude, that it scarcely implies either honour or reproach; and those who seriously profess to believe and obey Christ are generally distinguished by other names, whether they are spoken of with respect or derision."†

The Fifth Witness said, " It is objected that there is no certain example of infant baptism in the scriptures. To this I answer, there is no instance in which it is declared in so many terms that infants were baptized. But there are instances in which, according to every rule of rational construction, this fact is plainly involved. Lydia and her house, and the household of Stephanas, were baptized. He who has examined the meaning of the words house and household in the scriptures, cannot fail to perceive that, in their primary meaning, they denote children, and sometimes more remote descendants. Thus St. Paul said unto the jailer...'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thine house.' There is no reason to think that Paul knew what family the jailer had; on the contrary, he appears merely to have uttered the same doctrine which had before been announced to the Jews by St. Peter; 'The promise is to you, and to your children;" and to have used the word

* His Life, pages 164—166. † On Acts ii. 26.

house necessarily from this ignorance, in the manner in which it was customarily used by his countrymen. Of this manner, we have many examples in the Old Testament: 'Come thou, and all thy house, into the ark.'* We know that the house of Noah consisted of his wife and children. See also Ruth iv. 12; 1 Kings viii. 10—14; xvi. 3. 21, 22. In all these passages, and in others almost innumerable, the children only are meant. Thus the house of Israel, the house of Judah, the house of Joseph, are phrases exactly synonymous with the children of Israel, the children of Judah, and the children of Joseph. In this manner, then, Paul unquestionably used the term in the passage already quoted; accordingly it is subjoined, 'He was baptized, and all his, straightway.'"†...

"Moses informs us...that all Israel, not only the men, but their little ones, also their wives, and the stranger who was in their camp, from the hewer of wood to the drawer of water, were included in the covenant made, or in better terms solemnly renewed, with God on that day.‡...This covenant also was made between God and the succeeding generations of this people; 'Neither with you only, (*i. e.*, with Israel then present,) do I make this covenant, but with him that standeth here with us this day before the Lord our God; *and also with him that is not here with us this day.*'...It was the same covenant formerly made by God with Abraham, and afterwards renewed with Isaac and Jacob; it was the same in substance with that before mentioned, Deut. xxix. 12, 13.§

"From these passages it is evident, as I apprehend beyond all reasonable debate, that the covenant made with Abraham was made, first, with himself; secondly, with his household generally; thirdly, with his servants by name, whether born in his house, or bought with his money; fourthly, with his infant children, afterwards limited particularly to the descendants of Isaac, and afterwards again to the descendants of Jacob; fifthly, to these descendants as a people; sixthly, to their little ones, or infants, in every generation; seventhly, to their servants universally; and eighthly, to the strangers who dwelt in their nation.

"To all these, God covenanted that he would 'be their God, and that they should be his people.' I say this is evident beyond debate; because it is expressed in so many words, and those as unambiguous as are found in any language....

"I shall" now "attempt to show, that infant baptism is in the

* Gen. vii. 1. † See vol. 2, p. 523. ‡ Deut. xxix. 9—15. § Vol. 2, p. 530.

scriptures confined to the children of professing christians. This doctrine I derive from the constitution of the Abrahamic church.

"All the Israelites were circumcised...all made a public profession of religion, or entered publicly into covenant with God; they all also partook regularly of the passover; thus the children of every *Jew* were the children of a professor of religion, and as such received the initiatory seal of the covenant of grace.

"As the covenant under the christian dispensation is, unless in some respect or other altered by the authority which first promulged it, exactly the same as it was under the Abrahamic dispensation, and cannot be lawfully either widened or narrowed by man; it follows that children are now to be considered in exactly the same light as under the former dispensation, unless the scriptures have evidently changed the state of their relations and privileges."*

Cross-examined.—"It is objected farther, that all baptized persons are, by that class of christians to whom I have attached myself, considered as members of the christian church; yet those who are baptized in infancy are not treated as if they possess this character; particularly, they are not admitted to the sacramental supper, nor made objects of ecclesiastical discipline.

"This objection has in my view a more serious import than any other which has been alleged...and I acknowledge without hesitation, that the conduct of those with whom I am in immediate communion, and, so far as I know them, their opinions also, with regard to this subject, are in a greater or less degree erroneous and indefensible....

"I am equally dissatisfied with my own former views and precepts respecting this subject, and readily admit that a part of what is contained in this objection is justly chargeable on many churches, and many ministers, who hold the doctrine of infant baptism. But it lies only against *the errors of the men who adopt this doctrine*, and not against the doctrine itself.

"That infants should be baptized, and then left by ministers and churches in a situation undistinguishable from that of other children, appears to me irreconcileable with any scriptural views of the nature and importance of this sacrament."†

The Sixth Witness said, "As a pedobaptist, I am accustomed, along with my brethren of the same persuasion, to administer the ordinance of baptism, as occasions present themselves, both privately

* Vol. 2, page 538. † Vol. 2, page 525.

and publicly, to the infant children of believers; and we are countenanced in so doing by our churches and congregations."*

"I am satisfied that the argument respecting the validity of infant baptism is far from being so difficult and formidable, as, from the numberless pamphlets and volumes that have been written upon either side of the question, many are ready without further inquiry to suppose.†...

"We state our argument thus.—Before the coming of Christ, the covenant of grace had been revealed; and under that covenant there existed a divinely instituted connexion between children and their parents; the sign and seal of the blessings of the covenant, was, by divine appointment, administered to children; and there can be produced no satisfactory evidence of this connexion having been done away.‡...'I (said the Lord,) will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, to be a God to thee and thy seed after thee.'§...'Thou shalt be a *father* of many nations.' If this means, as Paul teaches us, his being the spiritual father of believers in all nations, then must not *these* be the seed of Abraham, to whom he promises to be a God? If objections are brought to this, they ought, I think, to be brought against the apostle.‖...

"Circumcision is most expressly pronounced, by the apostle, to have been a sign and seal of spiritual blessings, and especially of that first blessing of the gospel covenant, justification by faith: 'Abraham,' says he, 'received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had being yet uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also:' the meaning of which words evidently is, not that the sign of circumcision was to Abraham the seal of his own personal justification; for this would be incompatible with subsequent *trial*, and with his 'giving diligence,' like other believers, 'to make his calling and election sure,' inasmuch as it is impossible to arrive at a greater degree of certainty, than that which is given by the sealed testimony of God; but rather that it was the seal of that covenant, according to whose provisions all sinners, believing as he believed, were like him to be justified by faith."¶...

"It was this covenant, then, which the apostle so explicitly

* Page 13. † Page 16. ‡ Page 31.
§ Page 11. Pages 14, 15. ¶ Page 38.

declares to have been the covenant of grace, 'confirmed before of God in Christ,' that the rite of circumcision was connected....If the connexion between parents and children, recognized in that ordinance, had belonged only to the old or Sinai covenant, and if the ordinance of circumcision, instead of being 'of the fathers,' had been exclusively 'of Moses,' pertaining solely to that temporary dispensation of which he was the mediator; we should then have seen a good reason why both the connexion itself, and the ordinance that marked it, should have ceased together, when the dispensation came to a close with which they were associated. But if circumcision was 'not of Moses, but of the fathers;' if it originally pertained to a covenant that never 'decayeth or waxeth old;' and if, under that covenant, children were connected with their parents in the application of the sign and seal; then we must insist upon it that the burden of proof rests upon our opponents.*...And if we can succeed in establishing the previous existence of the connexion of children with their parents, under the same 'covenant of promise,' with that which constitutes the ground of fellowship in the Christian church; if, I say, we can succeed in this, then we have a title to demand *an explicit statute of repeal*. Explicit authority for *relinquishing* a practice is quite as indispensable as explicit authority for *commencing* one.†...To speak of the abolition, tacit or express, of the old economy, the Mosaic dispensation, is nothing to the purpose; because the apostle assures us, that the covenant of circumcision, so far from being a part of the law, and partaking of its temporary and evanescent nature, was a covenant which existed long before it, which could not be disannulled either by its introduction or its cessation, but which continues to this day. By confounding this covenant with the law, and including any part of its gracious provisions in 'that which decayed and waxed old, and vanished away,' you set the law 'against the promises of God,' and throw into confusion and inconclusiveness the simple and beautiful reasoning of the apostle. That the particular *rite* is changed, we have abundant evidence; and satisfactory reasons for the change might be assigned, although it does not come within our province with certainty to assign them, nor can they reasonably be demanded of us."‡...

"I have endeavoured to show that the covenant made with Abraham was the gospel covenant, the covenant of grace under which we live, and which is the basis of the New Testament church.

* Page 52. † Page 22. ‡ Page 53.

That the ordinance of circumcision was attached to that covenant, and, as the sign of its blessings and seal of its promises, was by divine command administered to children; that although there is abundant evidence of a change in the rite or ordinance, there is none whatever of any such change in its administration as excludes children from being any longer the legitimate subjects of its observance.*...Then there is one point of fact undeniably clear, namely, that the apostles baptized households or families. As to this there can be no question. It should be noticed, too, that a man's house (οἶκος) most properly means his children, his offspring, his descendants, and is generally used to denote these even exclusively. I refer" you, gentlemen, "to the following instances:—Ruth iv. 12; 1 Kings xiv. 10—14; xvi. 3; xxi. 22; 1 Tim. iii. 4, &c."†...

"Another remarkable circumstance, akin to the preceding, is, that when the judaizing teachers insisted on the Gentile converts submitting to circumcision, although there can be no doubt that this was done in every case, in connexion with their children; yet, when the doctrine and practice of these perverters of the gospel came to be discussed in the assembly of the apostles and elders and brethren at Jerusalem, no notice whatsoever is taken of the inconsistency with the spirituality of the new dispensation of administering *any* sign to *children*, on the admission of their parents into the christian commonwealth, or of treating them as if they continued to have any connexion at all with their parents, in reference to the blessings of the covenant, or of the church of God. Now, surely, if such connexion really *was* inconsistent with the spirituality of the gospel and the New Testament church, it must have been an error of no trifling moment; and it is reasonable to conclude that upon an occasion which brought the subject so immediately and formally under notice, some disproval should have been intimated, and recorded, of the error itself, and the practice founded upon it; and the absence of all such intimation is a collateral evidence that there was no such inconsistency, and that children were to be held, and treated, as sustaining the same covenant relation to their parents as formerly."‡...

"The circumstances of the early history of the church, after the apostolic age, are unaccountable on anti-pedobaptist principles... because Origen, Cyprian, Justin Martyn, and Austin say, that in their day it was the custom to baptize infants."§...

* Page 96. † Page 126. ‡ Page 133. § Pages 138—152.

"It has often been asked by anti-pedobaptists, What are the uses of infant baptism? What *good ends* are answered by it?...It ought first to be observed, however, that with regard to all such questions as the one so often put, and so confidently answered, there is obviously a previous question, namely,... *Is it, or is it not, a divine institution?* If it be once shown to possess the authority of the supreme Lawgiver, it will not be disputed that our first and immediate duty is compliance."*...

"Still, however, we freely admit, it is reasonable to expect that there should be some uses apparent, of whatever the God of infinite wisdom enjoins; and on the present occasion we feel no difficulty in meeting the enquiry. Of baptism, as administered to infants, we are at no loss to point out uses, which we conceive to be of no trivial magnitude. We shall endeavour to show these, by considering it in the two following lights:—1. As a memorial of fundamental truths; 2. As a remembrancer of important duties, and an encouragement to their performance.

"1. In considering infant baptism in the former of these views, *as a memorial of fundamental truth*, it becomes necessary to take some notice, in the first place, of the general signification of the rite itself. It appears, then, to me very evident, that the emblematic significance of baptism is to be found in the *purifying nature of the element employed in it;* in the cleansing virtue of water. Almost every instance in which the ordinance is spoken of, or alluded to, with any intimation of its meaning, might be adduced in proof of this. The following passages are but a specimen of many; Acts xxii. 16; Eph. v. 25, 26; Titus iii. 5.†...

"Let it not be said, the ground of ridicule is, that infants are incapable of that faith which the New Testament affirms to be necessary to baptism, and of which baptism is the profession. It has often been remarked, and it has never been satisfactorily answered, that this mode of reasoning, if valid for the exclusion of infants from baptism, must be equally valid for their exclusion from salvation. If it be a correct syllogism—Believing is necessary to baptism; infants are incapable of believing; therefore no infants ought to be baptized: then the following must be correct too—Believing is necessary to salvation; infants are incapable of believing; therefore infants cannot be saved."‡...

"2. I now proceed to view it as *a remembrancer of important duties, and an encouragement to their performance.*

* Page 153. † Page 154. ‡ Page 182.

"The ordinance is inseparably connected, and all christian parents ought so to regard it, with the incumbent duty of 'bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' If this connexion is lost sight of; if it is not contemplated at the time, and is practically disregarded afterwards, the ordinance becomes nothing better than a useless ceremony, and an idle and profane mockery of its Divine Author....It is evident that the pouring of a little water on an infant's face, can in itself do it no good; and as little would be the immersion of the whole body. The mere external recognition of its connexion with the christian community can be of no benefit, except as associated with subsequent training, for the performance of the duties, and the enjoyment of the blessings, of that community....Multitudes, who have their children baptized, never think of the ordinance in any such light, and are quite regardless of the obligations which, I will not say it imposes, but which it implies and brings to mind, is a melancholy truth. And I would earnestly admonish those parents of the guilt they are contracting, by their solemn mockery of Heaven, in the careless profanation of a Divine Institution. The abuse is awfully extensive.*...

"We consider baptism as an ordinance for believers and their children. I am aware, indeed, that I do not express the sentiment of *all* pedobaptists, when I say that the administration of it to children ought to be confined to those of *believers only*.†... I am well aware of the different sentiments entertained, and the different course pursued, by many (I might, I fear, say by *most*) of my pedobaptist brethren in the south. I cannot but think them very far in the wrong; and I have never been able to find any thing like fixed and precise ground among them on this subject. Some place the warrant for baptizing in a willingness to be instructed; some, in a general profession of christianity and of faith in the Bible; others, in the attendance of the party applying for it at church, and bringing his family with him, so as to put them in the way of good; while others still, I believe, go so far as to concur with the Established Church of England, and administer it to all who apply, considering it as the privilege of the child, without regard to the profession and character of the parent at all. Now in all this there is an undefined and unsettled laxity, which appears to me highly pernicious in its practical consequences, and which, moreover, tends to weaken, and even, if followed fairly out, to overthrow, the whole of the argument

* Pages 188, 189. † Page 191.

for infant baptism that is founded on the covenant relation, so distinctly recognised in scripture, between parent and child.*...

"The chief ground on which a looser principle than the one I have assumed has been usually vindicated, by our southern brethren, has been derived from the practice of the Jewish church in regard to circumcision. All children that were Jews by birth, it is alleged, were indiscriminately admitted to the prescribed ordinance, their parents professing faith in the God of Abraham, and no evidence being required at the time of the genuineness of that profession; and we should proceed on a similar principle in regard to baptism.†...

"The Jewish church was national. When the new dispensation was introduced, it was no longer to be so. Its constitution was to be remodelled. The wicked were to be shaken out of it. It was to be revived and purified. It was not to consist of nations; but of individuals, of all nations, separated from the world by the grace of God.‡...

"To the children of godly parents I would briefly but affectionately say, You enjoy, or you have enjoyed, a most precious privilege; a blessing for which you cannot be sufficiently thankful. But the privilege may, like every other, be abused or neglected, and the blessing by this means converted to a curse....If your parents considered aright what they were doing, when they presented you to the Lord in the ordinance of baptism, it was not with them a season of thoughtless merriment, on the giving of a name to their child, but a time of tender feeling, of serious reflection, of solicitous anticipation, of solemn prayer. They brought you in faith to Jesus—they resolved that you should be trained in the fear of the Lord, in his nurture and admonition—and they looked with earnest desire for the grace of God to enable them to fulfil their resolution. I speak not of vows made by them in your name, and far less of god-fathers and god-mothers stepping in between you and your parents, and taking upon themselves a gratuitous responsibility in your behalf; because I find none of these things in my Bible, and regard them, along with some other practices, as inventions of men, human appendages to a simple institution. But at your baptism, your parents had before them an impressive remembrancer of the obligations, on their part, arising from the promises of God's covenant."§

Cross-examined.—"Mere natural descent from Abraham could not save the 'Jew,' neither can mere natural relation to godly

* Page 194. † Page 195. ‡ Page 196. § Page 203.

parents save the 'Gentile.' All the variety of external privilege and observance could not save the one; outward connexion with the purest church on earth, and the most punctilious attendance upon all its institutions, cannot save the other.*...

"There are too many, especially of the young, who in the outset of their christian profession have not their minds directed at all to the subject (baptism). It is an unexamined point; and these persons, when, in this state of want of knowledge and information, they happen to fall in with a baptist friend, a baptist book, or a baptist argument, feel themselves unprepared to meet what is new and startling; their minds are in danger of being immediately unsettled, and of hastily adopting what is presented, with no little plausibility, and possibly, too, with too much imposing confidence."†

The SEVENTH WITNESS said; "It appears, from Gen. xvii. 7—14, that the seed of Abraham, while they were infants, and no more than eight days old, were in covenant with God. He was their God, and promised to give them a portion in the resurrection, and in the city of the heavenly Jerusalem. It is expressly said, verse 11, that their circumcision was a token of the covenant between God and them. It was a token of the whole covenant, both of the promise of eternal life, and of the land of Canaan. There is not the least hint given that circumcision was a token of both these promises to the adult, and only the promise of Canaan to infants. As Abraham's posterity were, by virtue of this covenant, to have the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, provided they did not break covenant with God, and apostatise from him; so, circumcised infants should certainly, by virtue of this covenant, have the Almighty for their God, and so be brought to heaven, provided they did not afterwards apostatise from God's covenant. And forasmuch as they were not capable of this apostacy, as long as they remained infants, it is certain that, if they died in their infancy, they should be partakers of that blessed resurrection, and of all that eternal happiness of the future world, which are signified by that divine and comprehensive promise, 'I will be their God.'

"Baptism now, like circumcision of old, makes persons to become the seed of Abraham, and heirs to the promises of the covenant which God made with him. This it does to the utmost extent of its administration. Now we have seen that it is administered to

* Page 214. † Page 14.

believers and their houses; evidently referring to this enlarged and comprehensive administration, the apostle says, 'For ye are all the children of God,' &c.... See Gal. iii. 26—29.*

"We may now understand the reason of the scripture fact, that apostles and evangelists baptized believers and their houses. They considered baptism as christian circumcision; and therefore, in observing the ordinance, they observed the ancient extent of the administration. It is particularly worthy of remark, that, according to the apostolic epistles, the persons addressed, or referred to as belonging to the first churches of Christ, were precisely of the classes said to have been circumcised in the family of Abraham. They were parents, and children, and servants; that is, slaves born in the house, or bought with money. (See Eph. vi. 1—9; Col. iii. 20—25; iv. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2; Titus ii. 1—10; 1 Peter ii. 18—25; iii. 1—12.) As all these classes were circumcised under the Old Testament, they were, and therefore are to be, still baptized under the New Testament.†...

"Unless we meet with a believer, we have no warrant to dispense any ordinance; but when we do meet with a believer, it is not for us to disown a former observance of the ordinance which God appointed, or refuse to do to his family, as the apostles and evangelists did to the families of the primitive christians."‡

Cross-examined.—"Unless the children of believing parents shall come, in the event of their arriving at years capable of it, to embrace the faith of Christ themselves, they have no privilege of their own, for, in no case, can men become the sons of God from carnal descent.§...

"I doubt not that some of my views will be questioned, because they are new. Both friends and opponents may be stumbled at first, by my explanation of some of the terms connected with the subject. They will be ready to say, If this be just, why was it never thought of before? I answer, if the fact be as the question supposes, it ought not to surprise us, because the study of language is yet in its infancy.||... I have been sometimes accused of endeavouring to perplex and to confound inquirers; if I ever do, it must be very wrong."¶

The Eighth Witness said, "There are four dispensations under

* Page 206, 207. † Page 210. ‡ Page 194.
§ Page 229. || Page 219. ¶ Page 225.

which religion has principally subsisted since the fall, viz., the dispensation of the *light of nature*, the *Abrahamic*, the *Mosaic*, and the *Christian*. Now each of these casts some light upon this awful scene, and administers some hope as to suffering and dying infants. Let it then be inquired,

"First, What judgment doth reason, or the *light of nature*, pass upon their case? There are but two ways in which reason can account for this procedure of providence, viz., by supposing these suffering infants to have existed in some former state, or that they will exist in some future.

"Some have imagined, that they have existed and misbehaved in a former state of being, and that their sufferings in the present are a correction or punishment for evils done there. This, Platonic philosophy taught....But this pre-existence of infants being a matter of absolute uncertainty, unsupported by any solid or probable grounds, reason derives its principal satisfaction from the supposition of their existence in a state after death. There the Almighty Rewarder can give them pleasures and entertainments, abundantly to counterbalance the sufferings of their present state.

"This is what reason, I say, surmises and hopes, but cannot certainly conclude. It wants some revelation, some promise from God, to give stability and vigour to these wavering hopes. And under all the conflicts and pains which he sees his dying child suffer, the pious parent has nothing from the light of nature whereon to trust, but the uncovenanted goodness and mercy of God. Now were it not, in these circumstances, a most desirable thing that God would give us some revelation or promise concerning our infants? Some covenant to assure us that they are the objects of his favour and peculiar regard; and as they suffer and die in this world, so they shall be raised again to life and happiness in the other. Was not, I ask, some such covenant, revelation, or promise, concerning our infants, what nature greatly wanted, wished for, and desired?...

"There is a very rational and just sense in which God may be said to establish his covenant with infants. For the scripture expressly says, that he 'established his covenant' even 'with the cattle and the fowl;' solemnly engaging no more 'to drown them by a flood.'* Is there anything strange, then, or unreasonable, in God's establishing his covenant with infants; solemnly engaging to pour his Spirit and blessing on them? Or that the evils they suffer,

* Gen. ix. 9, 10, 12, 13.

in consequence of Adam's sin, shall be removed, and amply recompensed through the righteousness of Christ?...

"Secondly, This we see done in the *Abrahamic dispensation.* For as God's covenant transaction with Abraham was the foundation or charter of the church, which, in after ages, he intended to gather, and to erect among men; so here he gives pious parents an express promise and revelation concerning their infants. He promises to be a God 'to Abraham and to his seed,' and takes his infants into covenant, together with himself; commanding the token of the covenant to be solemnly affixed to them, as a standing testimony or sign that Jehovah was their God.*...

"Now when the Almighty covenants and promises to be the God of these infants, what does it imply? Undoubtedly something great, viz., that he will be in a peculiar manner their guardian and benefactor; that he will take them under the especial patronage and care of his providence, influences of his Spirit, and ministration of his angels; and that, if they died in their infant state, before any transgression had put them out of the covenant, they should certainly be raised to a happiness after death....

"Thirdly, The *Mosaic dispensation,* and the further strength which this gives to these rational hopes. Now here we see another covenant besides that of circumcision, into which infants were taken.†...Hence, then, it is most evident, that the Jewish infants, in consequence of their dedication to God, and admission into his covenant, were in a peculiar manner his; his property, and his children, in a sense in which the infants of the idolatrous and uncircumcised Gentiles were not. But of these, multitudes no doubt died in their infant state. What" now "might be concluded concerning the case of such? Undoubtedly this,—That as they died in covenant with God, (by which covenant he had engaged to take them for a 'people to himself,' 'to acknowledge them as 'his children,' and to be to them a God,) and as no advantage nor happiness was given them in this world, at all answerable to their characters, but they miserably languished, like all other infants, and at last died under the primitive condemnation or judgment, it therefore certainly remained, that they will be raised again, and exist in some after-state, where a happiness will be given them suitable to these great promises, and where they will be treated as the people and children of God....These are the hopes which REASON surmises,

* Gen. xvii. 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14. † See Deut. xxix. 10, 11, 12.

and which the several dispensations, both of ABRAHAM and MOSES, strongly confirm. We proceed to observe,

"Fourthly, How they are further brightened by the DISPENSATION OF JESUS CHRIST. As this was to be the last and the most perfect display of God's mercy to fallen men, in which the riches of his abounding grace were to be most fully revealed, it can never be imagined to come short, in any points, of the two former dispensations. Did God take the infants of believers into covenant with himself, under Abraham and Moses, and command that, as a standing token of it, 'the seal of the covenant' should be solemnly affixed to them; but under Jesus his Son, has he made no such manifestation of his merciful regard to them; admitted them visibly into no covenant, nor appointed any token that he receives them as his children, and that he will be to them a God? How utterly unlikely, as well as uncomfortable, is the thought. Thanks to his mercy! we can with good assurance say, that is not the case."*...

It being impossible to deny, then, that the infants of believers have still a right to their ancient unrepealed privilege of being admitted with their parents into God's covenant, and of having its token applied to them, the consequence is inevitable, That they have then a right to baptism, the appointed token of God's covenant, and the only initiatory rite by which persons are now admitted into it.

"The point is further proved thus—FROM THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT: The covenant which God made with Abraham and his seed,† (into which his infants were taken, together with himself, by the rite of circumcision,) that covenant, I say, is the very same which we are now under, even the christian or gospel covenant; and Abraham, in that transaction, acted and is considered under the character of our father, the father of us believing Gentiles: the original grants, therefore, and privileges of that covenant must necessarily belong to us, believing Gentiles, his seed. Now it was an indisputable grant or privilege of that covenant that infants should be received, together with their parents, into it, and solemnly pass under its sacrament or seal. This grant, therefore, or privilege in behalf of our infants, we, believing Gentiles, may now confidently claim.

"That we, believing Gentiles, are the seed really included and intended in that covenant, and that Abraham, in that transaction,

* Pages 2—9. † Gen. xvii.

was considered our father, is a point actually and most clearly determined by St. Paul, Rom. iv. and Gal. iii., where he is explaining the nature and extent of the christian or gospel covenant; he quotes this covenant made with Abraham, Gen. xvii., refers to it, reasons from it, and fetches arguments thence to prove that believers from among the Gentiles are, under the christian dispensation, to be fellow-heirs with the Jews, and are the real seed of Abraham, intended in that covenant. See Rom. iv. 9, particularly verses 16, 17.

"Seeing, then, it is incontestible, that we believing Gentiles are the seed intended in that covenant, it follows that we have an undoubted right to all its privileges and grants; consequently, to the admissiion of our infants into it, and consequently to their passing under its token or sign.

"This token or sign was originally circumcision; but when God sent his Son into the world, further to explain and confirm this covenant, and to publish it to all nations, he was pleased to alter its token, or initiating rite, from circumcision to baptism; partly perhaps as circumcision was a painful and bloody rite, and obnoxious to great reproach and contempt amongst the Gentiles; but principally because both sexes were now to be alike visibly received into the covenant; and under this new dispensation of it, there was to be neither male nor female. Gal. iii. 28.

"That circumcision is abolished, is acknowledged by all; but the Abrahamic covenant still subsisting, and being no other than the gospel covenant,... it being acknowledged that baptism is now the appointed token or sign; it hence evidently follows, that baptism now succeeds in the room of circumcision. Accordingly it is called the christian circumcision, or circumcision of Christ. Col. ii. 11, 12....

"Thus, then, stands the argument in short. If we are Christ's (believers), then are we Abraham's seed, Gal. iii. 29; but if we are Abraham's seed, we have then a right to all the grants and privileges of that covenant which God made with Abraham, and with his seed; but the admission of his infants, together with himself, was an indisputable grant, or privilege, of that covenant; therefore, as it was given to Abraham our father, it must necessarily remain and endure to his seed.

"Infants are not baptized as being themselves the seed of Abraham; but as being the children, or property, of those who are the seed of Abraham; for as Abraham's faith brought not himself only,

but his infants, together with him, into the covenant of God; so the faith of Abraham's seed (believers), bring not themselves only, but their infants together with them, into the same covenant; else the covenant would not be established in the same manner to his seed, as it was to Abraham himself; which yet is plainly promised. Gen. xvii. 7, 10, 11."*

Cross-examined.—"By infants of believers, are not to be understood only their natural offspring, but any infants which are their property, or members of their household, or for whose religious education they will solemnly undertake. Thus not only Abraham's own children, but all 'born in his house, or bought with his money,' he was commanded to 'circumcise.' Gen. xvii. 13. So when Lydia, the jailer, and Stephanas were baptized, it is particularly observed that their household was baptized with them. Foundling infants, therefore, are very rationally brought to baptism, by those who will engage solemnly for their christian education.†...

"We are not to imagine that all infants dying such but those of believers, or all who die unbaptized, will be annihilated, or never rise again; but the superior advantage to believers' infants above others is: 1. That with respect to these, God has been pleased to lay himself under a more particular covenant, or promise, of a resurrection to a future happiness; whereas the others are left more to his uncovenanted mercy. And, 2. Their circumstances in a future state may, agreeably to all the moral perfections of God, be supposed more happy and advantageous than their's who were never thus solemnly devoted to him. It being an evident and important part of the scheme of God's moral government, that great blessings and favours shall be conferred upon some, in consequence, and as a reward, of the earnest and sincere prayers and piety of others.

"All rational creatures, there is reason to believe, are somewhere or other placed in a state of discipline or probation, before they pass into a state of fixed and unalterable bliss. Heaven itself was, if it be not at present, a state of trial to angels. Infants, dying such, therefore, there is ground to presume, pass into such a state. Now as in our present state of trial, some are placed in circumstances far more advantageous and favourable than others, so probably it is in the state to which dying infants pass. Abraham's posterity were put in circumstances more favourable for attaining virtue and happiness than other nations of the earth, on account of their father's

* Pages 20—24. † Page 70.

piety. The same may be justly hoped as to the dying infants of good men, who, according to God's command, have been solemnly devoted to him, whom he hath acknowledged for 'his children,' and to whom he hath by a sacred covenant 'promised to be a God.' ...

"As it thus evidently appears that, in the original construction and frame of his church, provision was made that the infants of God's people should be admitted into his *covenant*, so it may be added, that such a *solemn dedication* as is made in baptism of an infant by its parents to God, the Supreme Parent, seems to be a most *natural* and rational service; a service which a pious mind can scarce possibly forbear. Having received so great a gift and trust from the Almighty Sovereign, how natural and proper is it, that soon upon its birth, and while a sense of the obligation is yet warm upon the heart, he should make some *solemn acknowledgment* that he has received it from God, should openly devote it to him, and lay himself under a *sacred vow* to educate it religiously, and bring it up in his fear. The light of nature itself seems plainly to have taught this. It was the custom of the Romans, on the ninth day from the child's birth,... for its friends and relations to bring it to the temple, and, before the altars of the gods, to recommend it to the protection of some tutelar deity. A ceremony of the same nature also was performed among the Greeks.*...

"The baptism of infants was the undoubted practice of the Christian Church, in its purest and first ages, the ages immediately succeeding the apostles, who could not but know what the apostolic doctrine and practice was as to this matter. This I apprehend to be an argument of great weight. For the inquiry being about a fact which could not but be publicly and perfectly known, and not possible to be mistaken, in the ages immediately succeeding the apostles, the sense of those ages concerning this fact must needs be of great moment in deciding the point.†...

"These, now, are the evidence on which we rest the antiquity of this fact, and by which we prove the baptism of infants to have been the practice in the Christian Church from the very beginning. Justin Martyn about forty years, Ireneus about sixty-seven, and Tertullian about a hundred years after the apostles, give plain intimations of its being the christian practice in their times. From Origen, a hundred and ten years, and from Cyprian and the synod of sixty-six bishops, a hundred and fifty years from the above date,

* Pages 15—17. † Page 39.

we have indisputable proof of its being then the established and standing usage of the church. And Austin and Pelagius, about three hundred and ten years after the apostles, (though the latter was under the strongest temptation, and even necessity, to deny the baptism of infants, had there been any possible ground for it,) acknowledge that they never heard nor read of any, whether true christian, heretic, or schismatic, who denied baptism to infants.*...

"To weaken the testimony of the ancient writers and fathers upon this point, some have objected the many foolish and absurd opinions and interpretations of scripture with which their writings abound. But this is extremely weak. For they are not here appealed to as reasoners or interpreters, but only as historians, or witnesses to a public standing fact.

"If any think it strange that we have no more express testimonies to this practice of the church in the writings of these fathers, let him consider, that the far greater part of their writings are lost, and that it is but little more than their names, and a few pieces of their works, especially as to the first age, that are transmitted down to us; and also that the baptism of infants being then universally practised, and no doubts or dispute having ever been moved about it; and it being likewise the constant, ever-prevailing custom of all the enemies to christianity, both Jews and pagans, to admit infants to a participation of their religious ceremonies and rites together with their parents; these things considered, it will not appear strange that this point is so rarely touched on in the writings of those times.†...

"With whatever credulity as to miracles, said to be wrought in their days, these early writers may be charged, it cannot at all affect their evidence as to the fact here in debate. For as there was no possibility of their being themselves deceived as to this matter, so neither would they be under temptation to falsify in their accounts of it. Nor, indeed, had the temptation been ever so strong, could they have ventured to falsify, in a fact notorious to all the world, and when every Christian then living could have stepped forth and borne witness to the falsehood of their account."‡

"No less than ninety different heresies are said to have sprung up in the three first centuries. Ireneus, Epiphanias, Philastrius, Austin, and Theodoret, it may be justly observed, each of these wrote catalogues of the several sects and sort of Christians they had ever

* Page 53. † Page 40. ‡ Page 55.

heard of,—but none of them mention any that denied infant baptism, except those who denied all baptism.*...

"So that upon the whole it appears a clear and a very strongly attested fact: that the practice of baptizing infants was primitive and apostolic; and that the first Christian churches were everywhere formed and established upon this scheme.†... Baptizing in (or unto) the name, signifies commending a person to the peculiar blessing and patronage, of him or them in whose name he is baptized."‡

The NINTH WITNESS said, "The question," which I am now come here to prove, "is whether the infant children of believing parents are entitled to be made parties to the covenant of grace by the act of their parents and the administration of baptism?

"In favour of infant baptism, the following arguments may be adduced. Some of them are more direct than others, but the" court "will judge whether, taken altogether, they do not establish this practice of the church, continued to us from the earliest ages upon the strongest basis of SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY.

"As it has been established that baptism was put by our Lord himself and his apostles in the room of circumcision, as an initiatory rite into the covenant of grace; and as the infant children of believers under the Old Testament were entitled to the covenant benefits of the latter ordinance; and the children of Christian believers are not expressly excluded from entering into the same covenant by baptism; the absence of such an explicit exclusion is sufficient proof of their title to baptism.

"For if the covenant be the same in all its spiritual blessings, and an express change was made by our Lord in the *sign* and *seal* of that covenant, but no change at all in the subjects of it, no one can have a right to carry that change further than the Lawgiver himself, and to exclude the children of believers from entering his covenant by baptism, when they had always been entitled to enter it by circumcision. This is a censurable interference with the authority of God; a presumptuous attempt to fashion the new dispensation in this respect so as to conform it to a mere human opinion of fitness and propriety. For to say that, because baptism is directed to be administered to believers when adults are spoken of, it follows that children who are not capable of personal faith are excluded from baptism, is only to argue in the same manner as if it were contended, that because cir-

* Page 58. † Page 62. ‡ Page 64.

cumcision, when adults were the subjects, was only to be administered to believers, therefore, infants were excluded from that ordinance, which is contrary to the fact. This argument will not certainly exclude them from baptism by way of inference; and by no act of the Maker and Mediator of the covenant are they shut out.

"If it had been intended to exclude infants from entering into the new covenant by baptism, the absence of every prohibitory expression to this effect in the New Testament must have been misleading to all men, and especially to the Jewish believers. ...

"In fact, we know that divers '*baptisms*' existed under the law, and we have every reason to believe that the admission of proselytes into the profession of Judaism was really and truly marked by a washing with water in a ritual and ceremonial manner. I have always understood that Maimonides is perfectly correct when he says, 'In all ages, when a heathen (or stranger by nation) was willing to enter into the covenant of Israel, and gather himself under the wings of the majesty of God, and take upon himself the yoke of the law, he must be first *circumcised*, and, secondly, *baptized*, and thirdly, bring a sacrifice; or if the party were a woman, then she must be first *baptized*, and, secondly, bring a sacrifice.'...

"This baptism of proselytes, as Lightfoot has fully shewed, was a baptism of *families*, and comprehended their infant children; and the rite was a symbol of their being washed from the pollution of idolatry. Very different indeed in the extent of its import and office was Christian baptism to the Jewish baptisms; nevertheless this shews that the Jews were familiar with the rite, as it extended to children in cases of conversions from idolatry; and, as far at least as the converts from paganism to christianity were concerned, they could not but understand Christian baptism to extend to the infant children of Gentile proselytes, unless there had been, what we nowhere find in the discourses of Christ, and the writings of the apostles, an *express exception* of them. In like manner their own practice of infant circumcision must have misled them; for if they were taught that baptism was the initiatory seal of the Christian covenant, and had taken the place of circumcision, which St. Paul had informed them was 'a seal of the righteousness which is by faith,' how should they have understood that their children were no longer to be taken into the covenant of God, as under their own former religion, unless they had been told that this exclusion of children from all covenant relation to God was one of those *pecu-*

liarites of the Christian dispensation in which it differed from the religion of the patriarchs and Moses? This was surely a great change; a change which must have made great impression upon a serious and affectionate Jewish parent, who could now no longer covenant with God for his children, or place his children in a special covenant relation to the Lord of the whole earth; a change indeed so great, a placing of the children of Christian parents in so inferior, and, so to speak, *outcast* a condition, in comparison of the believing Jews whilst the Abrahamic covenant remained in force, that not only in order to prevent mistake did it require an express enunciation, but in the nature of the thing it must have given rise to so many objections, or at least inquiries, that explanation of the reasons of this peculiarity might naturally be expected to occur in the writings of the apostles, and especially in those of St. Paul. On the contrary, the very phraseology of these inspired men, when touching the subject of the children of believers only incidentally, was calculated to confirm the ancient practice, in opposition to what we are told is the true doctrine of the gospel upon this point. For instance: how could the Jews have understood the words of Peter at the Pentecost, but as calling both upon them and their children to be baptized? 'Repent, and be baptized, for the promise is unto you and your children.' For that both are included may be proved, says a sensible writer, by considering,...

"Who the speaker was, and from what source he received his religious knowledge.—The apostle was a Jew; he knew that he himself had been admitted in infancy, and that it was the ordinary practice of the church to admit infants, to membership. And he likewise knew that in this they acted on the authority of that place where God promises to Abraham 'to be a God unto him and his seed.' Now, if the apostle knew all this, in what sense would he understand the term children as distinguished from their parents?... children and seed meaning the same thing. And as the apostle well knew that the term *seed* intended infants, though not mere infants only; and that infants were circumcised and received into the church as being the seed; what else could he understand by the term *children*, when mentioned with their parents?...

"But the Baptists will have it that τεκνα, children, in this place means only *adult posterity*. And, if so, the Jews, to whom he spoke, unless they understood St. Peter in a way in which it was morally impossible they should, would infallibly have understood

him wrong. Certainly all men, when acting freely, will understand words in that way which is most familiar to them; and nothing could be more so to the Jews than to understand such a speech as Peter's to mean adults and infants.*...

"If it be asked, 'Of what import, then, is baptism to children, if as infants they already stand in a favourable relation to Christ?' The answer is, It is of the same import as circumcision was to Abraham, which was 'a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised;' it confirmed all the providence of the covenant of grace to him, and made the church of God visible to men. It is of the same import as baptism to the eunuch, who had faith already, and a willingness to submit to the rite before it was administered to him. He stood at that moment in the condition, not of a *candidate* for introduction into the church, but of an *accepted* candidate; he was *virtually* a member, though not *formally* so; and his baptism was not merely a sign of his faith, but a *confirming* sign of God's covenant relation to him as a pardoned and accepted man, and gave him a security for the continuance and increase of the grace of the covenant, as he was prepared to receive it. Thus this *previous* relation of infants to Christ, as accepted by him, is an argument for their baptism, not against it; seeing it is by that they are visibly recognised as the formal members of his church, and have the full grace of the covenant confirmed and sealed to them, with an increase of grace as they are fitted to receive it, besides the advantage of visible connexion with the church, and of that obligation which is taken upon themselves by their parents to train them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

"In both views, then, 'of such is the kingdom of God;' members of his church on earth, and of his church in heaven, if they die in infancy, for the one is necessarily involved in the other. No one can be of the kingdom of heaven who does not stand in a vital, sanctifying relation to Christ as the head of his mystical body, the church on earth; and no one can be of the kingdom of God on earth, a member of his true church, and die in that relation, without entering that state of glory to which his adoption on earth makes him an heir through Christ.†...

"If the baptism of the infant children of believers was not practised by the apostles and by the primitive churches, when and where did the practice commence? To this question the Baptist writers

* Pages 409—414. † Pages 419—420.

can give no answer. It is an innovation, according to them, not upon the *circumstances* of a sacrament, but upon its *essential principle;* and yet its introduction produced no struggle; was never noticed by any general or provincial council; and excited no controversy. This itself is strong presumptuous proof of its *early* antiquity. On the other hand, we can point out the only ancient writer who opposed infant baptism. This was Tertullian...he gives it gravely as a reason why infants should not be baptized, that Christ says, 'Suffer the little children to come unto me,' therefore they must stay till they are able to come, that is, till they are grown up. Yet with all his zeal, he allowed that infants ought to be baptized if *their lives be in danger*, and thus evidently shows that his opposition to the baptism of infants in ordinary, rested upon a very different principle from that of modern anti-pedobaptists....

"The benefits of this sacrament require to be briefly exhibited.... To the infant child it is a visible reception into the same covenant of the church,—a pledge of acceptance through Christ; the bestowment of a title to all the grace of the covenant, as circumstances may require, and as the mind of the child may be capable, or made capable, of receiving it....In a word, it is both as to infants and to adults the sign and pledge of that inward grace, which, although modified in its operations by the difference of their circumstances, has respect to, and flows from, a covenant relation to each of the three *Persons* in whose *one name* they are baptized."*

The Counsel for the Defendants, in reply to the evidence of the preceding Witnesses, addressed the Jury as follows:—

Gentlemen, we have just been made acquainted with some of the primary reasons which the Plaintiffs give for christening infants. The principal reason appears to be, the covenant made with Abraham. This covenant, therefore, merits particular attention, because there is scarcely another subject on which such erroneous sentiments prevail, nor one where erroneous sentiments have exerted a more pernicious influence on the true understanding of the scriptures. This covenant, then, had respect to two different seeds, the one spiritual, the other carnal. The wide difference between the two

* Pages 428, 429.

seeds lies here; the one received the rite of circumcision in the flesh to be a token of the covenant, and to denote a typical people of God, in order to their enjoyment of the land of Canaan, which was to be a type of gospel rest. The other was alike circumcised, in token of a more extensive covenant, to denote a spiritual people,* and as a type of the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ,† in order to their enjoyment of actual rest, the kingdom of heaven. "God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai, but Sarah shall her name be. And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her; and she shall be a mother of nations: kings of people shall be of her.... Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed, and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him;... my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear."‡ The ratification of this promise was the change of Sarah's name, originally meaning, my lady, my princess, the head of one family only; but now, a princess of multitudes, of whom should come "kings of people;" which appears to have a much higher meaning than what was said to Abraham of his natural seed, "kings shall come out of thee." The promise to her may have allusion to the spiritual seed, as mentioned Exod. xix. 6, 7, "Ye shall be to me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." Saints are made kings and priests, by the one seed,§ the descendant of Abraham, whose title is the "Prince of the kings of the earth.‖

The spiritual covenant made with Abraham and his seed was through the line of Isaac, down to Joseph, the husband of Mary, in order to show our Lord's direct descent from him, whose seed was ordained to perpetuate the pure worship of God until the coming of the one seed, "which is Christ." And Abraham was the only one we read of who "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness which he had, yet being uncircumcised, that he might be the father of all them that believe."¶

The covenant made with him and his carnal seed, had respect to earthly blessings. "God talked with Abraham, saying, As for me, behold my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations; neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham, for a father of many nations have I made

* Rom. iv. 11. † Col. ii. 11. ‡ Gen. xvii. 15, 16, 18, 19, 21.
§ Gal. iii. 16. ‖ Rev. i. 5. ¶ See Rom. iv. 11—13.

thee. And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee. And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. And God said to Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee, in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man-child among you shall be circumcised, and ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be a token of the covenant between me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations; he that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.... In the self-same day was Abraham circumcised, and Ishmael his son, and all the men of his house, born in his house, and bought with his money of the stranger, were circumcised with him.*"

Now, gentlemen, it is this latter covenant upon which the Plaintiffs raise the superstructure of infant sprinkling; a covenant under which every male slave, bought by an Israelite, or born in his house, together with his own children, were compelled, as it respected the initiatory rite, to submit; a covenant which, in this respect, knew no distinction of persons between the descendants of Abraham and the descendants of their slaves, one "law being for both." Yet the plaintiffs, while they pretend to abide by this covenant, venture to make a difference, where the Almighty made none. They tell us they christen the infants of believers after the manner that the Jews of old circumcised them. But the Jews of old, gentlemen, so far as we are made acquainted with their history, were mostly unbelievers.† And yet this is the sandy foundation on which they "build...wood, hay, stubble,"—a foundation that cannot withstand the floods, and materials which must perish "with the using." If the Witnesses do not know this, they must doubtless suspect it; for they cannot satisfy themselves whether the rite is the privilege of the child, or

* Gen. xvii. 3—14. 26, 27. † Deut. ix. 23.

of the parent; or whence they derive their authority for christening at all.

If, as they imagine, the rite of christening succeeded to that of circumcision, the nature of infants being the same now as it was in the time of Abraham, the former, like the latter, can be nothing more than a legal rite,—a yoke of bondage; respecting which Paul said to the Galatians, "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing."* To this the Witnesses in a great measure subscribe, when they acknowledge that the rite is of no advantage to the child, unless it die before it commit sin.

Gentlemen, circumcision and baptism are so widely different, that no warrant can be drawn from the use of the former rite, for the observance of the latter; and even if the plaintiffs were able (which they are not,) to establish the point, that the male children of proselytes were sprinkled as well as circumcised, it would not alter their position a whit, for children, under the new dispensation, are not amenable to any law.

The First Witness founds his statement on sheer assumption, which renders disproof unnecessary. If, as he asserts, pedobaptism in the Jewish church had been so known, usual, and frequent, why did he not give some proof of it? The reason is plain, gentlemen, the scriptures afford none! If his brother, the Ninth Witness, had been convinced it was so known, usual, and frequent, would he have expressed himself in the following modest manner? "We have *every reason to believe* that the admission of proselytes was marked by a washing!" The former also asserts that "Christ took baptism into his hands, as he found it." True! But did he not find it, as it had been instituted by his heavenly Father, at the beginning of the gospel, through the instrumentality of his servant John? Is not his assertion, that it is not forbidden to baptize infants, and therefore they are to be baptized, a decisive answer to my learned friend, and a clenching argument in favour of the corrupt practices of the church of Rome? It is not forbidden to baptize bells, and horses, and asses; therefore bells, and horses, and asses are to be baptized. Gentlemen, in opposition to all such assumptions, we maintain that the total silence of the Will respecting any subject whatever is demonstrative that the Testator never intended us to believe in, nor to practise, any thing which is not inculcated by it. If we deny this, we are left "to grope for the wall like the blind."†

* Gal. v. 2. † Isa. lix. 10.

Are our vain fancies to supply imaginary omissions in the Word of God? Hearken, gentlemen, to what the Will says; "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it."* "Whatsoever thing I command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it."† And can any alteration be made in, or anything substituted for, a positive ordinance, without either adding to, or diminishing from, the word? The holy prophets did not deliver the word of God deceitfully. It is said, "Thus saith the Lord, Stand in the courts of the Lord's house, and speak unto all the cities of Judah, which come to worship in the Lord's house, all the words that I command thee to speak to them; diminish not a word."‡ Neither was Christ unfaithful to his people. He said, "Henceforth I call you not servants, for the servant knoweth not what his Lord doeth: but I have called you friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you."§ Nor did the apostles conceal the truth; "For I have not shunned (says Paul,) to declare unto you *all* the counsel of God."‖ What further proof need we that every thing is revealed which is required of us, and every thing which it is profitable for us to know.

The Church of England professes, by her 14th Article, although she does not act upon it, to abide by the before-mentioned quotations. She has sent three Witnesses here; and another body of professors, who stand upon such equivocal ground that it is a disputed point whether they are Churchmen or Dissenters, have sent two. The First Witness is one of the latter. Consequently, as the founder of his sect was in principle a Churchman, and the Witness a devoted follower of his, the article adverted to will, according to his own creed, refute his assertion, that "the silence of scripture on infant sprinkling confirms the use of it." It runs thus: "Voluntary works, besides, over, and above God's commandments, which they (the Catholics) call works of supererogation, cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety. For by them men do declare, that they do not only render unto God as much as they are bound to do, but that they do much more for his sake than of bounden duty is required." Whilst admitting that the silence of scripture sanctions infant sprinkling, must it not, by the same rule, also sanction the sprinkling of bells, &c.?

The utility of christening, this Witness acknowledges, is but of a

* Deut. iv. 2. † Deut. xii. 32. See also Rev. xxii. 18, 19.
‡ Jer. xxvi. 2. § John xv. 15. ‖ Acts xx. 27.

negative character, and the rite itself only a nominal dedication. Is this then, gentlemen, any thing more than "having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof?"* He has told you that in this country we are born christians, but afterwards, when cross-examined, confesses that having Abraham and Sarah for our parents would not entitle us to the blessing of the new covenant, (in other words, would not make us christians;) nor that anything which *another* may be disposed to do in our behalf could entitle us to it. And what is the purport, gentlemen, of sprinkling an infant? Is it not to make it a christian, which it cannot make itself, and which *myriads* that are sprinkled never become?

Again; he says, "under the dispensation of the gospel, neither circumcision," nor any thing that the Gentile can call excellent, "availeth any thing, but a new creature." Then what availeth christening, an act which our opponents esteem most excellent? According to the evidence of this Witness, they think the salvation of an infant depends upon it, or why do they FLY for a minister to officiate, when the child is at the point of death. In giving his evidence, he spoke as a stranger to the truth; but when cross-examined, as a christian.

It appears, gentlemen, that the doctrine of being born christians,—in other words, being born members of *the* church,—is not peculiar to the sect of which the first Witness is the representative, but is that of another large and influential one which the Tenth Witness represents, and is also held, in some measure, by those who are represented by the Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth Witnesses. This I shall show, by reading a short extract out of the book before me. "The children of professing christians are already in *the* church. They were born members. Their baptism did not make them members. It was a public ratification and recognition of their membership. They were baptized, because they were members. They received the seal of the covenant, because they were already in covenant, by virtue of their birth. This blessed privilege is their 'birth-right.' Of course, the only question they can ask themselves is, not—Shall we enter the church, and profess to be connected with Christ's family? But, Shall we continue in it; or act the part of ungrateful deserters? Shall we be thankful for this privilege, and gratefully recognise and confirm it by our own act; or shall we renounce our baptism, disown and deny the Saviour, in whose name we have been

* 2 Tim. iii. 5.

enrolled as members of his family, and become open apostates from that family? This is the real question to be decided, and a truly solemn question it is. The case is indeed very deplorable. Destruction is on either hand. For 'the *unbelieving* shall have their part in the lake of fire.' (Rev. xxi. 6.) And 'the hope of the hypocrite shall perish.' (Job viii. 13.)"* Behold, then, gentlemen, the unhappy situation of the children born of *professing* christians!

The Second Witnes tells you of believing christians; as if there could be christians who were not believers. According to the tenor of the Will, no man is entitled to the name of christian until he believes, and has professed his belief in the ordinance of baptism. Baptism, gentlemen, is a public act, ordained by the Testator,† whereby every believer is openly to confess his Lord before men;‡ and until such confession is made, he does not justify God,§ nor is he authorised to sit down at the Testator's table, in fulfilment of his command, "This do in remembrance of me." Is it not unreasonable of this Witness, then, to complain that "men are very prone to bear up themselves upon the piety of their ancestors," when every one that is brought up within the Establishment is taught, as soon as he is able to speak, that he has been made, through the instrumentality of his ancestors, or through those whom they appointed, "a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." Children, says he, are to be baptized, because they make a great part of all nations. But, gentlemen, this is perverting the commission, which applies to those only who are of sufficient age to understand it.‖ Again, he says, Baptism is a rite of initiation to christians, as circumcision was to the Jews; but I have before shown you that that is only exemplified in the case of Abraham. For the circumcision of Jewish infants was only initiatory to earthly privileges; while the baptism of believers is an introduction to heavenly enjoyments.

In his cross-examination, he explained why believers were called christians; and after he had endeavoured to prove that baptism was ordained for their children, he turns round and declares, that if Abraham's faith be not found in our hearts, it will be no advantage that his blood runs in our veins; and that men are so far from being

* Infant Baptism Scriptural and Reasonable; by Samuel Miller, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, New Jersey, pages 60, 61.

† Matt. xxviii. 19. ‡ Ibid. x. 32. § Luke vii. 29. ‖ See Acts x. 35.

God's children because they had godly parents, that Christ tells the Jews, who came forth of Abraham's loins, that they were of their father the devil. What can be gathered, gentlemen, from evidence so contradictory? In the first place, this Witness would persuade you that the children of believers are different from other children, while in the second, he asserts that they may be, at the same time, children of Satan.

Mark, gentlemen, what he has said. "If this privilege (baptism) be denied, the children of christian parents are in a worse condition since Christ's coming, than they were before." Observe, also, that the Ninth Witness followed in the same strain. But what folly do their assertions evince. Children, under the gospel, are freed from the painful operation to which Jewish children were subjected; and no negligencc of their parents can be any bar, in the eyes of God, to their approaching him in the way of his appointment.

The sentiments which fell from the Fourth Witness are conclusive for my clients. From his own confession, when he published the "Force of Truth," he neither knew what TRUTH was, nor had any confidence in his own creed. Under these circumstances, he ought to have refrained both from administering christening and the Lord's supper; "for whatsoever is not of faith is sin."* Instead of this, he attempted to quiet his conscience by saying to himself, "He that believeth shall not make haste; while by his own showing he was not a believer, and therefore applied the text improperly. On the contrary, according to the little light that was in him, he ought to have made haste to relinquish his station, because it required of him duties which he could not conscientiously perform. Whenever an individual has acquired some knowledge of the truth, although he may not at the time know where the sheep of Christ are folded, he will feel himself imperatively called upon to retire from any place where they are not. Is it not evident, gentlemen, that he was trying to serve two masters; he had a desire to leave the society in which he moved, and seek for instruction among those who were better informed; but, pleading the fear of being misled, he continued where he was, stifling his conscience, and cleaving to the principles he had advanced. And why did he cleave to them? Because he deprecated the avowal of a change of sentiment, lest it should bring discredit upon his publication,—a publication which, by his own account, was written when he had not even a smat-

* Rom. xiv. 23.

tering of the "first principles of the doctrine of Christ." Had he applied himself solely to the study of the scriptures, (which he informs us he afterwards did,) and with the disposition there recommended, doubtless he would have arrived at a satisfactory conclusion, and not have remained in the state of perplexity and doubt which is evidenced by his testimony, and which proves that he studied them under a strong bias in favour of pre-conceived opinions.

After nine months' study, it would seem, he was so fully satisfied that the infant children of believers are the proper subjects of baptism, that he has never since been much troubled about it. Mark, gentlemen, this significant word MUCH; it speaks volumes, and demonstrates in the clearest manner, not only that he had found no authority in the Will for the conclusion to which he had come, but that his conscience could not bear the probe, and that therefore it was kept in a state of constant agitation. Nor need this be wondered at, when he declares, in his notes on John iii. 22—24, that "the baptism of Jesus was doubtless of adults alone." Can there be a doubt in the breast of any thinking person, that had he come to the study of the question free and unprejudiced, his conclusion would have been the reverse of what he states it to have been?

But why does this Witness and his fellows denominate us anti-pedobaptists? What is the meaning of the word pedobaptist? Is it not a word invented of man, expressive of his not being a follower of Christ, who established and commanded baptism on a confession of faith? Therefore it is that the Plaintiffs, denying us our true designation, BAPTISTS, denominate us anti-pedobaptists; thus demonstrating that we are, what they are not, the followers of Christ.*

Gentlemen, it is generally considered that it requires at least seven years to make proficiency even in an earthly profession; and must it not be the extreme of ignorance to imagine that an individual could not only search the scriptures, to know the will of God, and to learn the way of salvation, but to be fitted for the incomparable office of minister of the gospel, in the short space of nine months?

We have, gentlemen, upwards of six hundred thousand proofs (the number of Jews who fell in the wilderness,) that circumcision was not the sign of regeneration. And, gentlemen, how many myriads of proofs have we that christening is not. The Testator, speaking of the Jews who perished, said, "Your fathers did eat

* John xiv. 21; Matt. xv. 9.

manna in the wilderness, and are dead;" and to show that they were dead in the most awful sense of the term, he contrasts their state with the state of those who eat his flesh and drink his blood, saying, "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die."*

The difference, gentlemen, between circumcision and christening is, that the one was commanded of God, the other is of man; the former was of especial benefit, as it established the birth-right of the individual to whom it was administered; but of what benefit is the latter? None, that has yet been discovered, either to parent or child, except giving the latter a claim on the parish, which claim may now be made independent of it. Is not the new institution, by which the Testator implies that none but adults can be parties to it, sufficient of itself, without any particular prohibition, to annul the old one? This Witness remarks, "We hear of households being baptized, without limitation or exception." True; but, gentlemen, is it not recorded that in these instances the members of the households were believers; and is not this record a sufficient limitation to such-like households only, and an exception of all others?

"The circumcision of infants," says he, "was enjoined, with denunciations of wrath against those who neglected it." The denunciation was against the uncircumcised,† (which was a warning to the parents to see that the rite was observed;)‡ but it was not against the parents. In like manner, the denunciation is equally severe against the unbaptized adult.§ Genuine baptism is the great privilege of the individual, not the duty or privilege of parents. The duty of believing parents is to bring their children up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;|| not to see them christened.

In his cross-examination, this Witness allows that those who believe and obey Christ are distinguished by other names than that of christian; and yet he remains among, and professses to be one with, "the vast and heterogeneous multitude denominated christians, but whose right to the title he denies.

My next business, gentlemen, is with the Fifth Witness; and I think I shall succeed in shewing, by the following passages from the Will, that the words house and household do not "properly denote

* John vi. 49—51. 58. † Gen. xvii. 14. ‡ Exod. iv. 24.
§ Mark xvi. 16. || Eph. vi. 4.

a man's children;" that they are not "generally used (as the Sixth Witness asserts they are,) to denote these even exclusively;" but that when it is intended particularly to show that the house did contain children, the children are mentioned as well as the house; and that, whenever either house or household is mentioned in relation to believers, young children, by the manner of expression, are uniformly excluded. "For I know that he will command his *children* and his *household* after him," &c.* "And Joseph nourished his father, and his *brethren*, and all his father's household.... And four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your *household*, and for food for your *little ones*."† "And all the *house* of Joseph, and his *brethren*, and his father's *house*, only their *little ones* and their flocks and their herds, they left in the land of Goshen."‡ "And thou shalt bring thy father and thy mother, and thy *brethren*, and all thy father's *household*, home unto thee."§ "And there were born unto him seven *sons* and three *daughters*... and a very great *household*."‖ "Then I took Jaazaniah ... and his *brethren*, and all his *sons*, and the whole house of the Rechabites."¶ "If they have called the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call *them* (his twelve disciples,) of his household."** Cornelius "called two of his household," (which were servants.)†† "Salute *them* which are of Aristobulus' household. Greet *them* that be of the household of Narcissus, *which are in the Lord*."‡‡ Let us do good unto all men, especially unto *them* which are of the *household of faith*."§§ "Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God."‖‖ *All the saints* salute you, chiefly they that are of *Cæsar's household*."¶¶ "Let the deacons be the husband of one wife, ruling their *children* and their own *houses* well."***

As this Witness is dissatisfied with his own views and practices, it is not likely, gentlemen, that they will satisfy you; I shall therefore content myself on this part of his evidence with merely calling your attention to what he says of the inconsistency of those who, while they advocate (what he calls) the sacrament, yet, after it has been performed, so far as the church and the ministers are concerned, leave the children to themselves; and who, while they pretend that

* Gen. xviii. 19. † Gen. xlvii. 12. 24. ‡ Gen. l. 8.
§ Josh. ii. 18. ‖ Job i. 2, 3. ¶ Jer. xxxv. 3.
** Matt. x. 25. †† Acts x. 7. ‡‡ Rom. xvi. 10, 11.
§§ Gal. vi. 10. ‖‖ Eph. ii. 19. ¶¶ Phil. iv. 22. *** 1 Tim. iii. 12.

the children are made christians by christening, will yet not allow them to partake of the supper, but keep them suspended, like the fabled coffin of Mahomet, between the earth and the sky.

This Witness, not knowing the Lord's will, presumes that the apostle Paul was as ignorant as himself; and thus, in respect to the jailor's house, he makes him speak at random, in order to prove that the apostle would baptize all who were brought to him. The foundation of christening, gentlemen, is so sandy, that the slightest storm of controversy demolishes every building that is raised upon it. This the Witness has ingenuity enough to discover, and therefore objects to the builders only.

Then with respect to the Sixth Witness; if he really believes in the doctrine which he comes here, "by soft words and hard arguments," to maintain, would he not, instead of saying, by way of extenuation, "We are countenanced by our churches and congregations," have boldly declared, by way of establishing it, "I take my stand on the New Testament...believing, as I do, in the exclusiveness of that authority...I feel that I cannot, without impiety, abridge, enlarge, or alter, or go beyond, or go aside from this divine record?"*

He takes his authority, indeed, for christening infants, from the Sacred Scriptures, but it is from the Old Testament—from the covenant made with Abraham, as we read in Gen xvii.; which authority, nevertheless, he himself repudiates, as the following extracts from a work of his now in my hand clearly proves. The extract to which I shall call your attention has respect to the answer which the Testator made to Pilate's question, "Art thou a king?" "The question relates to what Christ's words actually express. They involve a comparison between the past and the present, and they intimate a change—a change from what *had been*, to what was *now to be*....The 'NOW' announces a transition; a transition from a comparatively secular and worldly state of his kingdom, to a state essentially different. In this view, therefore,—and I do most sincerely believe it to be the true one,—in this view of the words, I say, we have in it an explicit disavowal, from the Redeemer's own lips, of the Old Testament constitution of his kingdom, as in any respect a model for the kingdom he was about to establish,—'not of this world.'—It is altogether peculiar and distinct—peculiar in the manner of its introduction—in the character of its subjects—

* Vide his Lecture in Liverpool, on the Voluntary Church Controversy, page 5.

in the bonds of union by which they are associated—in the spirituality of its design—and in the simplicity of its constitution."*

Notwithstanding, gentlemen, and in the face of this his own statement, this Witness would willingly persuade you that "the validity of infant baptism is not so formidable as it appears to be, from the number of pamphlets and volumes that have been written upon it." But can you imagine that he himself is convinced of it, when it is still on record, in the preface to his "Dissertation on Infant Baptism," that when his three Lectures on Rom. iv. 9—25 were reviewed by the late Mr. Archibald M'Clean, he did not see it good to reply. Whether he found the argument of his reviewer more difficult and formidable than he now states it to be, it is for you to judge, from the following excuse. "I was (said he) satisfied that my main positions were unshaken by the objections and counter reasonings of the reviewer; and the chief consideration that prevented me from then replying was, the time it would necessarily occupy, which I thought might on the whole be more profitably employed. I am not now sure whether this was a correct judgment." You, gentlemen, will doubtless think with me, that his excuse is very symptomatic of a doubt as to the scriptural character of the ground he had to stand upon, and especially when I inform you that the Dissertation did not make its appearance till after the lapse of seventeen years, when his reviewer was no more!

Again; you will recollect that, in his cross-examination, he said, "It (christening) is an unexamined point, especially with the young, who, in the outset of their christian profession, have not their minds directed at all to the subject." When, I would ask, does this outset commence? According to the gospel, it commences at the time the individual makes an open confession of faith; but with this Witness its commencement appears to be fanciful, or, according to the hackneyed phrase, when the individual becomes *pious*. But how does it happen that this Witness and his brethren admit young professors into their communion, while destitute of the knowledge of that rite by which, through the faith of their parents, it is pretended they are made christians? Is it any wonder that they should be "startled," when they happen to "fall in with a baptist friend, a baptist book, or a baptist argument?" An elucidation of this "startling" lately came under my own cognizance. An interesting female, of about eighteen years of age, a *member* of an Independent church, happened

* Lectures on Church Establishments, fifth thousand, pages 28, 29.

accidentally to be present at the baptism of three believers of her own sex; and their profession at the water's side had such an effect upon her, that she could scarcely overcome it. Some time afterwards, she acknowledged that the solemnity of the administration was so imposing, that it took possession of her mind, and, like a spectre, was constantly before her eyes. She admitted also that she had never read nor heard of any such institution; and yet she was in the habit of eating and drinking the emblems of the Lord's body and blood, the eating and drinking of which unworthily is followed by condemnation. But where lies the blame, gentlemen? Let those answer the question who christen infants! No wonder that the minds of the young creatures to whom this Witness refers are kept in an unsettled state; while he informs them that "the sign of circumcision *was not* to Abraham the seal of his own personal justification, for this would be incompatible with subsequent trial, and giving diligence, like other believers, to make his calling and election sure." Is it becoming a professor of the gospel, is it any indication of the gospel minister, to say this of him, whose faith *was* (not *to be*) accounted to him for righteousness; in whom all nations are to be blessed; and who is in the Will denominated FAITHFUL ABRAHAM?* Does it not rather indicate the objection of a carnal mind, a mind not yet released from "the gall of bitterness, and the bond of iniquity?" For what is faith, gentlemen? Is it not the believer's confidence, manifested in baptism, that he IS justified freely by the grace of God, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus?† Is it not to be assured that, in rising up out of the water, in which he had been typically buried with Christ, that he has passed from death unto life;‡ and that his life is hid with Christ in God?§ The believer, gentlemen, is as confident of having been born of God, as he is of having been born of woman.|| He never expresses himself parenthetically, after the manner of this Witness, when speaking of "the pleasing assurance that when numbered with the 'spirits of the just made perfect,' (if such shall be our happy attainment,) we shall learn the result in heaven."¶ Here then, I presume, we have the meaning of the following expression; "It is impossible to arrive at a greater degree of certainty than that which is given by the sealed testimony of God." But to whom, gentlemen, is it sealed?

* See Gal. iii. 6, 8, 9. † Rom. iii. 24. ‡ Col. ii, 12, 13.
§ Col. iii 3. || See John v. 1—3; 1 Thess. i. 4; 2 Tim. i. 12, & iv. 8.
¶ See Voluntary Church Lecture in Liverpool, page 34.

Not to the believer! For the man that does not know his salvation while here, will never know it hereafter.* At the same time, there may be many who now imagine they have a glimmering of hope, who, when they go hence, will find themselves numbered with those of whom the Testator speaks in Matt. vii. 21—23.

Baptist friends, baptist books, and baptist arguments appear to be sharp thorns in the sides of our opponents; whose wincing shows that they pierce deeply.

But I have not done with this Witness. He further says, that we have abundant evidence that the particular rite is changed, but "none whatever of any such change in its administration as to exclude children from being any longer subjects of its observance." He must be aware how difficult it would be to prove one of his assertions, without disproving the other. Infants are incapable of being taught; consequently, they cannot be subjects of an ordinance required of those only who have a capacity, not only to learn, but to do, the will of God. Every thing relating to the salvation of man is stated in plain and express terms; hence the prohibition not to add to, or take from, that which is revealed.

The statement of this Witness, respecting "no notice being taken of the inconsistency of administering any sign to children, on the admission of their parents to the christian commonwealth," is a mere begging the question. What proof does he bring of the apostles ever having christened children, or of the Jews ever desiring to have them christened? None. How then could such a thing be reported at Jerusalem? Or how could the disapproval of a nonentity be recorded? However, he is welcome to all the collateral evidence he can draw from it.

With his assertion, that "the circumstances of the early church, after the apostolic age, are unaccountable on anti-pedobaptist principles," because Origen, Cyprian, Justin Martyr, and Austin say that in their day it was the custom to baptize infants, I shall contrast what he has said elsewhere, on another subject. Listen, gentlemen to the extract I am about to read; he says, "What I find in the New Testament, I know to have divine authority; but by what criterion am I to ascertain the divine authority of what is originated by the counsels of men, after the lapse of hundreds of years? Am I to judge of the mere fact of its having in the providence of God been permitted to

* See Eccl. xi. 3; John xii. 46; Rom. viii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 5; Eph. i. 13, 14; Rev. xxii. 11.

take place? That would sanction every form of error, every kind and measure of corruption, and stamp with the approval of heaven all the anti-christian enormities of the 'man of sin' himself. Am I to judge by the principles of human expediency? Here, again, I am at sea—at sea without pilot or compass. Not only are the conceptions of expediency as various almost as the minds that form them, but in acting on such a principle, I feel myself at once bereft of the delightful assurance that I am following the will of my divine Master. No intimation, that I can find, having ever been given by him of any future abandonment of his original institutes to the discretion of his fallible creatures; to the will of his own subjects; the will of those whose only wisdom and whose only safety lie in following implicitly the will of their Lord. I know no way of finding a satisfactory answer to the question, What is expedient? but that of finding an answer to the previous question, What is the mind of Christ? And I have no way of finding an answer to this latter question, but that of direct appeal to his own inspired oracles. What I find there, I am safe to follow: all else leaves me in perplexity and doubt, both as to the propriety of my course, and as to the beneficial character of its ultimate results. When from the Holy Scriptures I can confidently say, This is God's way—this is Christ's way—my mind is at rest; I go forward with confidence, fearless of consequences. Tell me not of consequences; these are God's: tell me of duty; that 's mine." *

You recollect, gentlemen, that after the introduction of half-a-dozen *ifs*, this witness demands proof of an *explicit statute of repeal* of the connexion between children and parents. An explicit authority, says he, for *relinquishing* a practice, is quite as indispensable as an explicit authority for *commencing* one. I must again request your attention, while I read another paragraph, extracted from another of his pamphlets, because it so forcibly exhibits at once his tergiversation, and his aptitude to overturn in another place, by undeniable scriptural arguments, an error which he opposes; which undeniable scriptural arguments he, in this court, not only withholds, but denies, otherwise they would in the same manner overturn the error he espouses, and has come here to maintain.

"In regard," says he, "to the ancient Jewish constitution, considered as a national religious establishment, we are required to produce an *express statute of repeal*. Such a statute, it is alleged, is

* Voluntary Church Lecture, delivered in Liverpool, page 7.

necessary to the authoritative setting *aside* of any ancient institute. ...It does appear to me, and I am confident it will so appear to you, that there is what, in such a case, is quite equivalent to a statute of repeal, setting aside an old constitution. I mean, *a statute of enactment, introducing a new one.* If we have a new constitution actually introduced—historically and perceptibly introduced—is that not enough? I have called it more than equivalent to a statute of repeal....It involves the abrogation of what *had been*, and settles at the same time what *is now to be.* It leaves no licence to exercise our own wisdom, and follow our own counsels. I might add...We are not without what amounts, even in more direct terms, to such statute of repeal. We have our Lord's own declarations respecting the spiritual nature of his kingdom, and the fundamental change in its character and constitution, under the economy he had come to introduce."*

Now, gentlemen, it is for you to decide whether this witness does not merit the same treatment which the traveller in the fable received at the hands of the satyr, and for the same thing, blowing hot and cold.

Gentlemen, can this Witness in fairness be offended at my remarks, or feel that I am wanting in personal respect, while I have his own authority for using strong expressions? "There are," says he, "occasions in which strong language not only may, but ought to be used; when not to use it would indicate indifference to truth. When truths appear in danger, with which the glory of Christ, the interest of his kingdom, and the good of souls are bound up, the language of a tame and timid lukewarmness would be out of all congruity. Where there are 'thoughts that breathe,' there will be 'words that burn.'"†

I must here, gentlemen, once for all, denounce the traditions of men; they are not evidence, and deserve only to be 'cast, like a great millstone, into the sea, to be found no more.'‡ For the admonition given by God to his people of old is in a measure applicable to us, "Take heed to thyself, that thou be not snared by following them, after that they be destroyed from before thee: and that thou enquire not after their gods, saying, How did those nations serve their gods? even so will I do likewise."§

* Lecture on National Church Establishments, fifth thousand, page 30.

† Lecture delivered in Liverpool, page 26. ‡ Rev. xvi. 21. § Deut. xii. 30.

After the death of the apostle John, whose Revelation closes the sacred canon, the history of the *true church* became as unknown to the ancient historians as it has become to modern ones. What natural man knows anything of the church of God? These Witnesses never admit the authority to which they now appeal, when it makes against their particular views, an instance of which I have just given you; but here, because they presume it affords them some support, it is unquestionable, and ought to be admitted. But, gentlemen, "to the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."*

Gentlemen, "he whose eyes have once been opened by the Spirit of God to discern the excellency of the scriptures, never looks through the smoked glass of human tradition that he may discern it more clearly." But he who remains in darkness, makes bubbles of tradition, and so long as they float, he swims in hope, but when they burst, he sinks in despair!

"It has often been asked," said this Witness, "What are the uses of infant baptism? Is it a divine institution?" Yes, gentlemen, we reiterate both these questions. What are its uses? Is it a divine institution? *He* does not enter upon any proof with respect to the latter question; but gentlemen, before I conclude, I hope to convince you, from irrefragable authority, that it must be answered in the negative. And as to the former, how can an infant be benefited, either by the "memorial", or by the "remembrancer"? It is unconscious of the ceremony, save only the sensation arising from a few drops of water falling upon its face. And what instruction can be conveyed to the beholders, by the exhibition of a bowl of water, and the sprinkling of a little of it on an innocent, unconscious being, further than to point out to those who really think for themselves the inutility of the system — a system founded on error, but so established by tyrant custom, that nothing short of divine power can lead men to set it aside.

On the one hand we are informed, that "the significance of baptism is to be found in the purifying nature of the element employed;" and on the other, that if the parents do not contemplate it, at the time, with the impression that it is their incumbent duty to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, it is "a useless ceremony, and a profane mockery of its divine Author."

* Isaiah viii. 20.

But, gentlemen, God is not the author of this so-called baptism, this sprinkling of infants. This my learned friend has avowed, for, according to him even, "it flows rather from inference than positive appointment." Yes, it is man that is the author of it; and, consequently, it is unspeakably worse than a useless ceremony; it is a hypocritical mockery, of the deepest dye, and subjects all the individuals concerned in its administration, except the infants, to the severest punishment.*

Addressing the young, this Witness said, "You enjoy, or have enjoyed, a precious privilege." When did they enjoy it? Not when they were christened, for they were then unconscious of any thing. And when did they lose the enjoyment? Not when they came to manhood, for they could not lose a thing of which they were never possessed. While, should they die under the fatal presumption that they had been baptized according to the Will, their christening would be a curse to them: a blessing it could not be under any circumstances. Why, he himself asserts, that if, when they grow up, they are not sensible of the privilege they have received, this same privilege will be converted into a curse. But what have they to do with the sin of the parent, in pretending to confer upon them this so-called privilege? Nothing whatever. No blame, therefore, can on that account attach to them. "I," says he, "speak not of vows made by them (godfathers and godmothers) in your name, stepping in between you and your parents, and taking upon themselves a gratuitous responsibility on your behalf, because I find none of these things in my Bible." True, gentlemen, he does not; neither does he find christening in it. If he did, then he might in a scriptural manner have offered to pull out the mote out of his brother's eye; for christening was the immediate progenitor of sponsors. And what, I would ask, is the difference between godfathers "vowing" and parents "resolving"? Is not the one as much a gratuitous responsibility as the other? as much a prostitution of the divine ordinance as the other? as much the invention of men as the other?

The first part of his syllogism is correct; and he would do well to abide by his own reasoning. But this is no proof that the second part is correct also. Indeed, so far from being correct, it is untrue. There is not a word said in the gospel of the salvation of infants; therefore their future happiness cannot be dependent on believing.

* See Isaiah xxiv. 5, 6.

According to our views, his reasoning would be perfect, if the two cases were parallel; *i. e.*, if it could be proved that the eternal happiness of innocents and the salvation of sinful beings are one and the same thing; or that the deliverance from the effects of the temporal death introduced by the sin of Adam, and the deliverance from the second death, the effect of our personal offences, are synonymous. This he is unable to prove; consequently, we must deny the legitimacy of his reasoning. All that we are told of the future state of infants is contained in Jer. xxxi. 16, 17; and we may rest assured, from the equity that pervades the Will, that all who die before they are capable of committing sin will be eternally happy. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" * He "is righteous in all his ways." †

Gentlemen, I cannot discover in the Will any record of there "having existed, before the coming of Christ, a divinely instituted connexion between children and their parents;" but I can discover that there was a covenant established by the Almighty, with Abraham and his fleshly seed after him,‡ the token of which covenant was circumcision. By this they were known, and kept a distinct people, set apart by God himself as a type of what Abraham's spiritual seed should be, and as a significant token of the fulfilment of the promise, that in Abraham's seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed.§ But after the vail of the temple was rent, that token of distinction, having answered its purpose, was to cease, there being then no longer a privileged people. The Jews, thenceforward, were to have no advantage over the heathen.

That the Plaintiffs can find no precept in the Will for christening infants is evident, since their Witnesses cannot agree among themselves what children are entitled to the so-called privilege. This Witness condemns most of his southern brethren; especially those who concur with the Established Church. But if christening succeed to circumcision, as the Plaintiffs would have you believe, the Established Church is undoubtedly right, as, under the old dispensation, there was none of that invidious distinction which this Witness is in the habit of making. As regards circumcision, all were then upon an equality; the rich and the poor, the moral and the immoral, the pious and the impious. No matter whether their parents were believers or infidels, the rite gave a title to their portion of the

* Gen. xviii. 25.
† Ps. cxlv. 17.
‡ Gen. xvii.
§ Gen. xxii. 18.

land. But to what grants or privileges are the christened now entitled? He proves none, neither spiritual nor temporal, and yet he assumes that there are some; while even the assumed ones are altogether dependent upon the humour the parents may be in during the performance of the rite; for should they not be contemplating their duty, the rite, according to his assertion, is useless. Doubtless he is aware both of the perplexity of his case, and of its practical consequences, and therefore allows, that, if they were "followed fairly out," they would overturn the whole argument for infant christening. This tacitly admits that the argument in its favour is both difficult and formidable. Is it not natural, gentlemen, that the generality of parents should make a solemn mockery of the rite, when they see it constantly administered as a mere matter of form?

Hear, gentlemen, what my learned friend himself has said in another place:—"Crowds of sponsors, with infants, are collected at stated hours on week days into the parish church, where, with much inevitable confusion, and consequent want of reverence and solemnity, the baptismal service degenerates from the highest exercise of the church's faith into a lifeless and superstitious form. Instead of awakened sympathies and believing prayer, calling down blessings from heaven, and entering with tender, holy confidence into the thanksgiving of the church, we have at best no more than the cold correctness of official repetition; the essential and fervent spirituality of the service itself tending but to exhibit in more glaring and painful contrast the unimpressive, and to all appearance the unbelieving manner of its administration. The handle of objection afforded to our enemies by this, as well as the amount of dissatisfaction and distrust generated in the minds of many of our own members and friends, it would be difficult to estimate. It is a practical grievance, loudly demanding effectual redress."*

Again, gentlemen; how does this Witness prove that the words "a man's house," are generally used to denote exclusively his immediate offspring? Why, by four passages from the Old Testament, (quoted also by the Fifth Witness,) where the word house is put for the whole posterity of a man, both near and remote; and by one from the New Testament, where Paul is speaking of a bishop. When he gave you this quotation, he must have imagined that you would, as a matter of course, take his assertion for fact; or that

* Rev. H. M'Neile's Lectures on the Church of England, pages 100, 101.

you are, as I cannot suppose him to be, either ignorant or forgetful of the 12th verse of the same chapter,* which directly contradicts him, as it shows that the expression "a man's house," does not exclusively denote a man's children, but, on the contrary, rather excepts them. "Let the deacons be the husband of one wife, ruling their *children and* their own *houses* well!"

Did he not, gentlemen, after attempting to show the privilege children enjoyed by being born of godly parents, turn round and inform the court that natural descent from Abraham cannot save the Jew; neither can natural relation to godly parents save the Gentile? What privilege, then, let me ask, is attached to the christening of what he calls a godly parent's child, more than to that of an infidel's; and where, let me ask again, is the utility of the rite, or how is either parent or child advantaged by it? "Modern controversialists," says the Churchman's Monthly Review and Chronicle, "rush into a contest touching the effect of baptism on an unconscious infant, forgetting that we really know little more of the actual state and predicament of this numerous class of the inhabitants of the earth, than we do about the condition and prospects of the population of the moon!"†

And, let me ask, if parents resolving, at the time of christening a child, that it shall be trained up in the fear of the Lord, is not as much a human appendage to a simple institution, as sponsors vowing in their name? I am sure you will be of my opinion, that Episcopalians are by far more cautious in this respect than Independents. For the former, in addition to the natural conclusion that "regenerated" parents will bring up the child in the way it ought to go, require three sponsors, who engage that it shall "keep God's holy will and commandment, and walk in the same all the days of its life;" so that if one, or even two of them die, and its parents also, the child is not left without a spiritual adviser; while the latter take no such precaution, but trust the child to the implied guarantee of the parents only. But, gentlemen, if the child die in infancy, how can it be benefited, either by the parents' resolves, or the sponsors' vows? and if it live, does not experience prove that the adult is not advantaged by either?

The Seventh Witness, you observed, gentlemen, followed in the footsteps of the Sixth, but would have you believe that the apostles and evangelists considered baptism as christian circumcision,

* 1 Tim. iii. † May, 1843, page 371.

because, according to the apostolic epistles, the persons addressed as belonging to the first churches of Christ, were precisely the classes said to be circumcised in the family of Abraham. But this is a mistake. The Epistles were addressed to those only who had been baptized on a confession of sin, and a profession of faith: To the beloved of God; To the faithful; To the saints in Christ Jesus.* The grand difference between the two ordinances lies here. Under the former dispensation, the descendants of Abraham were born Jews; while under the new dispensation, no man is born a christian, neither does the mere act of baptism make him one.† No unbaptized person can, according to the Will, have a legitimate claim to the name of christian, nor to the promise made in Mark xvi. 16. "For, (it is said,) ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."‡ Here, gentlemen, it is plainly shown that it is faith in Christ, manifested by the ordinance of baptism, that makes us his, and joint-heirs with himself. Nor can faith now be "counted" to any one for "righteousness," until he hath put the "seal to his testimony."§ And the seal is baptism, by which he enters into the church, the ark of eternal salvation;‖ and by which he witnesseth that he is "come out" of the concision, and joined himself to the "circumcision, which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."¶

The covenant that was made with Abraham's fleshly seed, was a covenant of works—a promise of the enjoyment of the land of Canaan; to which the bare act of circumcision gave every Jewish child a claim; but none under the present dispensation has a claim to the enjoyment of the kingdom of heaven but those that "believe to the saving of the soul," and confess that belief by baptism. This Witness, with many of the others, argues in a circle; they begin by asserting that it is only the children of believers that have a claim under the covenant, and end where they began, by saying that "in no case can men become the sons of God by carnal descent."

* See Rom. i. 7.; 1 Cor. 1, 2.; Eph. i. 1.; Phil. i. 1.; Col. i. 2.
† See Acts viii. 13—23. ‡ Gal. iii. 26—29. § John iii. 33.
‖ Acts ii. 47. ¶ Phil. iii. 3.

Again; he says the apostle observed the administration of baptism to the same extent as was formerly observed in the administration of circumcision. Then, gentlemen, why does he not follow their example, and dispense it to all children? The faith of the parent was not a prerequisite to circumcision; why then should it be to christening? Great privileges, it is true, attached to the former ordinance, independent of the future conduct of those who were the subjects of it; but, by his own account, there are none whatever attached to the latter. For he declared, in his cross-examination, that if children, when they grew up, did not embrace the faith of Christ, their christening would profit them nothing. Where, then, we may again ask, is the utility of christening?

If, as this Witness states, he has long felt himself particularly called upon to give his evidence before you, will the Plaintiffs themselves, think you, be particularly pleased with it, or satisfied that they have subpœnaed him? Previously, the arguments in favour of the utility of christening were shrouded in mystery; and those of this Witness cast over them an additional fold. Of this we have his own acknowledgment.

Allow me next to call your particular attention to the second paragraph of the evidence of this Witness, as it strikingly exhibits the evil effects of christening infants. "Reasons (says he) may be assigned, though not to justify, yet to account for, much of the ignorance which prevails among christians respecting baptism. When they first have their attention directed to the observance of ordinances, they do not usually take much notice of baptism, which they believe they have already received, but rather of the Lord's supper, which they desire to partake of as the highest privilege of saints on earth.

To be reckoned one of the family of the Most High is certainly our highest privilege; but it behoves us to examine ourselves, and see that we have on a wedding garment, ere we presume to sit down at the table of his beloved Son; lest we should find ourselves in the situation of the intruder who is mentioned in the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel by Matthew. To whom did the Testator say, "This do in remembrance of me?" Was it not to his apostles, who, after the manner of their divine Master, must have been baptized in water; otherwise they could not have been his followers? (See Acts i. 21, 22.) And was it not those who "were sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints," whom Paul admonished respecting

the manner of partaking of the supper; men who believed and had been baptized? Is it not evident, then, from these things, and from what we read in Acts ii. 41, 42, that no one can be partaker of the supper of the Lord, previous to his being baptized on a profession of faith, without subjecting himself to the denunciation of the Apostle.

Mark, gentlemen, in what an awful situation this Witness places himself and his followers! He it is who affuses them in their infancy, and he it is who afterwards makes them believe that they have alread been scripturally baptized: and it is through his instrumentality, therefore, that they eat and drink unworthily. Nevertheless, they, being of age, are conjointly with himself responsible for their acts.

"It unfortunately happens," he has said, "that the ordinance of baptism has come into Protestant Churches with an uncommonly large share of the superstitions and absurdities of the Church of Rome." And, like his brother who preceded him, he rails against the practice of the Established Church, which is very unbecoming in them both. What do they but repudiate on the one hand what they maintain on the other? They ought first to correct their own practice, before they find fault with hers. What if she is called the elder daughter of the Church of Rome! Is not their own Church a younger branch of the same family? Of the same stock with her whom they accuse, they are even more inconsistent, for they make a difference between the infants of professors, and the infants of those who have made no profession, which she does not, but treats them, as they were created, all alike. Malachi (ii. 10,) asks, "Have we not all one Father? Hath not one God created us?" And Job, (xxxi. 15,) "Did not He that made me in the womb, make him?"

We are told by the Eighth Witness, that "there are four dispensations under which religion has principally subsisted since the fall." The first of which was, that of reason, or the light of nature. Uncharitable men might suppose from this, that the Witness and his constituents are the disciples of Gibbon or Hume. But far be such an idea from us. Nevertheless, we are of opinion that sentiments like these, coming from one who professes to be a minister of the gospel, cast a suspicion on the whole of his evidence. At what time since the creation of Adam, it may be asked, were the people left to the *light of nature?* Was it *reason*, or *light of nature*, that

revealed to Eve that her seed should bruize the serpent's head? Was it by reason, or the light of nature, that Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous? Or, that Enoch was translated that he should not see death? Or was it by reason, or the light of nature, that Noah had intimation that the Creator of the world was about to destroy it, or that he became heir of the righteousness which is by faith? But, gentlemen, it is unnecessary to reason with any man on this subject. There never was a period of the world in which the Lord's people were left to the light of nature. The Lord conversed immediately with Adam, Enoch prophesied of the Testator, and "Noah walked with God."

You noticed, gentlemen, that what this Witness calls the dispensation of Abraham and Moses confirming the *surmises* of *reason*, that Jewish infants, on account of their being circumcised, would be more favoured, if they died in an infantile state, than the uncircumcised infants of the heathen. And also, that from the tenor of his evidence we must conclude, that he accounts every Jew and every stranger who circumcised his child a believer. Consequently, as every Jewish male child was circumcised, it follows, according to him, that the descendants of Israel were a nation of believers.

That the Jews were more favoured than any other people is evident. "For what nation" was "there so great, who had God so nigh unto them?"* Yet by their disobedience they lost the whole of their privileges. It is on record that "Manasseh made Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to err, and to do worse than the heathen."† Therefore the Most High said to them, "I will cast you out of this land into a land that ye know not, neither ye nor your fathers, and there shall ye serve other gods, day and night, where I will not show you favour."‡ Where, then, at that time, was the difference between the heathens and the idolatrous Jews, except that the latter exceeded in wickedness; and where could be the difference between the circumcised and the uncircumcised infant? Were not both alike innocent? Let him prove his assertion, that if both had died in infancy, one would be more favoured than the other?

Could you have believed it, gentlemen, if you had not heard the evidence, that there could have been found in Great Britain, in these so-called enlightened days, eleven Congregational ministers,

* Deut. iv. 7. † 2 Chron. xxxiii. 9. ‡ Jer. xvi. 13.

the very pith and marrow of their sect, to recommend a Witness to this court, in support of such a dogma as that of a *future state of probation?* There is nothing of the sort to be found in the Will—nothing in support of it, nothing that can be construed into allusion to it—nothing but what declares that the final state of every individual is unalterably fixed, and finally determined, the moment life becomes extinct. Paul says, "Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; so shall we ever be with the Lord."* "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump."† "Absent from the body, present with the Lord."‡ Solomon says, "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave, whither thou goest."§ "If the tree fall toward the south or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be."‖ And David says, "They (the wicked) shall never see light."¶

Gentlemen, are we not, then, from the opinion of these eleven popular characters, openly published by their equally popular representative, authorised to affirm, that every individual who acknowledges any, or the whole of them, to be true Congregational preachers, must believe that there is a large portion, and that the innocent portion, of the human race, who cannot pass into a state of fixed and unalterable bliss, without first undergoing, in some place between earth and heaven, "a state of discipline or probation." Such persons have no way of convincing the world that they reject the unscriptural notion but by separating themselves from all who hold it.

Why, gentlemen, this doctrine of a future state of probation for the innocent outdoes, in a very material degree, that of the purgatory of the Church of Rome; that church, as I have read, charitably allows that all infants who die immediately after being christened go directly to heaven.

It must be evident, gentlemen, from what you have heard, that a desire to pry into the secret things of God has been, and still is, "the stumbling-block" to this denomination. And for further evidence of this, allow me to read a short extract from a work lately published. "The redemption of the elect, and of those who,

* 1 Thess. iv. 17. † 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52. ‡ 2 Cor. v. 8.
§ Eccl. ix. 10. ‖ Eccl. xi. 3. ¶ Ps. xlix. 19.

not being predestinated to salvation, had nevertheless acquired by their acceptance of the offered grace, Dr. Watts extended to their infants, exempting them from that annihilation, or transmigration, one of which, in his opinion, would be the lot of the infants of the unrighteous. He thought it agreeable to the law of nature and creation, that they who, by reason of their infancy, were utterly incapable of knowing either the laws of God, or the discoveries and proposals of his mercy, should be esteemed a part of their parents, or one with them, as to all the purposes of the gospel dispensation. It is not strange (he said) that God should make his covenant of grace so favourable and extensive to the children of pious persons, since there is an evident analogy, both in the kingdom of nature and in the kingdom of providence: for in these it is evident that children often inherit the gout, or the stone, a healthy and robust constitution or sickness and pain, poverty or riches, disgrace or honour, according to the condition and circumstances of the parents. And since it was so constituted in the law of innocency, and the covenant of works, whereby all the children of men should have been established in happiness, if Adam their father had continued in his obedience, and whereby all the posterity of Adam are now born in sin and misery, and involved in his fall; why may we not reasonably suppose the mercy of God would extend as far as his justice? Why may not the happiness of the new covenant of grace be conveyed to the infant offspring of those who have accepted it, which die in their infancy, and can have no state of trial in their own persons?"* Whether the Doctor's dogma be Platonic, Sadducean, Mahometan, or heathen, I leave you, gentlemen, to judge, but I hesitate not to affirm it has no foundation in the scriptures.

Gentlemen, as this Witness has called to the Plaintiff's aid the light of reason, and the heathen customs of the Romans and Greeks, we cannot, surely, be thought far wrong, or very illiberal, if we assert that the sprinkling of an infant partakes much more of a heathen rite than of a christian ordinance; nor for affirming that the leanness of their cause will not be much improved by the help of 'apostolic tradition' and 'authentic history;' for he acknowledges that, so far as respects the first ages, there is little more of what he denominates authentic history handed down beyond that of the *authors' names*, and a few pieces of their works. Add to which, he says it was a credulous age, and that no less than *ninety* different

* Southey's Memoir of Watts, page 29; published 1837.

heresies sprung up in the first century. Well, gentlemen, if it could be positively ascertained that infant sprinkling was not even then reckoned one of the heresies, what could that avail the Plaintiffs? It would only prove the correctness of Paul's prophecy, that "in the latter times some should depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and the doctrines of devils."* We know, from prophecy, that in the course of time the body of the people will be better informed than to christen infants, although they will have abundance of established authentic history in proof that the rite had been generally practised for several previous centuries.

Is there anything strange, he asks, in God's establishing his covenant with infants, solemnly engaging to pour his Spirit and blessing on them? I answer, that so far as living again is implied, there is not, "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."† But the promise of the Spirit is given to those only who are able to seek, and who do seek, for it, with their whole hearts; who follow the precepts of wisdom, which says, "If thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding, if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God."‡ If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?"§ What the future state of infants will be, is one of the secret things that belong to God. The Testator says, "By thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned."‖ Infants cannot utter words, therefore they cannot be condemned; and being innocent, they have nothing except "the second death" to be either justified or saved from.

After endeavouring to prove that the advantage of sprinkling is exclusively for the infants of believers, this Witness, when he is cross-examined, turns round and says, "By infants of believers are not to be understood only their natural offspring, but ANY infants which are their property, or members of their household, or whose religious education they will solemnly undertake. Foundling infants are therefore very *rationally* brought to baptism, by those who will engage solemnly for their christian education."

Behold, then, the child of a believer, with all its boasted privi-

* 1 Tim. iv. 1. † 1 Cor. xv. 22. ‡ Prov. ii. 3. 5.
§ Luke xi. 13. ‖ Matt. xii. 37.

leges, brought down to the lowest level—placed on a par with the child of the most abandoned of prostitutes! What better proof could this Witness give of his sophistry? or what more convincing evidence could we have that both he and his constituents, notwithstanding their learned arguments to the contrary, believe that all new-born infants are alike in the eyes of God, and that the supposed utility of christening them only regards this life; for it is manifest that if their foster father's engagement binds him to give them a christian education only, his engagement cannot benefit them if they die in infancy.

But again. It would be a natural inference from the evidence of this Witness, that the Creator had left it to the creature to determine which infants he shall positively save, and which he may either save or condemn, according to his good pleasure. But, gentlemen, what does he mean by unchristened infants being left to his "uncovenanted mercy?"—what is this uncovenanted mercy?—where does he derive his authority for making use of the term? From his evidence it is difficult to say which are the most favoured ones—the child of "a believer," christened without a sponsor, or the prostitute's, with one; although it may be presumed the latter, as it appears the cause of the child's acceptance is through the party guaranteeing. These are the infants, then, which, according to his evidence, are to be most favourably situated after death. And this is the evidence of one who, while he professes to dissent from the Established Church, not only holds the doctrine of sponsors, but holds what she even rejects—an intermediate place of probation; of one who, to help a lame cause, introduces heathen precedents! Gentlemen, his evidence clearly shows that he cannot satisfy himself that he "has express testimonies" for christening children, either in the Will or in the writings of the fathers, so called. He therefore endeavours to establish himself in his own views, by assuming that the practice was so universal, and that it was also the prevailing custom of *all the enemies of christianity* to admit infants to their rites, as sufficiently to account for its being so rarely touched on in the writings of those times. And is it not possible, nay very probable, as only fragments of these writings remain, that the pedobaptists have from time to time torn out all the leaves that militated against the doctrine of christening, and left remaining "only the foolish and absurd opinions and interpretations of scripture" which were received at those times of heresy and credulity. Be this as it may, after

all his endeavours to prove that the practice of christening infants was primitive and apostolic, his evidence amounts to no more than this; "*it* APPEARS *a clear and very strongly attested fact.*"

Be pleased, gentlemen, to bear in mind the contradictory evidence of the Sixth and Eighth Witnesses; both of them are Independents, yet the former denounces, whilst the latter advocates, sponsors.

Now, gentlemen, in order to give you further proof that neither the Eighth Witness, nor any of his sect, can satisfy themselves that they have scriptural authority for christening infants, I shall trespass upon your time while I read a brief extract from another publication. In reply to the question, "Who are the subjects of the ordinance of baptism, or to whom is it to be administered?" the writer, who stands high among his party, states; "The first, the most proper, or at least the most evident subjects of it are, persons who confess their sins, and profess to repent of them, and who accept of the grace and salvation offered in the gospel. But in the christian church, from its early ages, and we think from the Apostles' time, it hath been the custom also to baptize the infant children of professed christians; and that there be no such express and plain commands or examples of it written in the scriptures as we might have expected, yet there are several inferences to be drawn from what is written, which afford a just and reasonable encouragement to this practice, and guard it from the censure of superstition or of will-worship."* But, gentlemen, "the foundation of all inferential reasoning is, the unbroken harmony of divine truth. So that every inference must be unsound which is opposed to the analogy of faith, to express revelation, or any recorded fact in the word of God."

The Ninth Witness assumes that "it has been established that baptism was put, by our Lord himself and the apostles, in the room of circumcision." But he has given us no proof of it. Why, gentlemen, the very contrary is the truth. Baptism was added to, not substituted for, circumcision. Our Lord was both circumcised and baptized; and so was every repentant male, from the time of the first preaching of John, to the day of Pentecost; for in the intermediate time we read of no heathen being converted. After endeavouring to delude you by assumptions, he seeks to carry on the imposition with an IF. "If," says he, "the covenant be the same in all its spiritual blessings." Yes, if; but I have before proved to you that

* Life, Times, and Correspondence of the Rev. Isaac Watts, D.D., by the Rev. Thomas Milner, D.D., M.A., page 484.

it is not the same, and that the new covenant is as much superior to that made with the fleshly seed of Abraham,—which is the covenant this Witness appeals to,—as the kingdom of heaven is superior to the land of Canaan. You cannot fail, gentlemen, to have observed that all the Witnesses harp upon the same string, *i. e.*, upon what the circumcised were not, not upon what they were. They argue as if every man who circumcised his child was a believer. While this Witness asserts that the absence of an explicit exclusion of children is sufficient proof of their title to baptism. Again, then, I ask, Have not bells, and horses, and asses the same title to it?

"We have," says this Witness, "every reason to believe that the admission of proselytes was marked by a washing." But, gentlemen, "*every reason to believe*" is no evidence; neither does *his opinion* furnish ground to conclude "that Maimonides is right." And I call upon him to show proof that females went through any initiatory ceremony as a token of entering the covenant. Lightfoot, so often quoted, appears to be a very influential character; for many of the Witnesses make him their authority in preference to the Will. The Jews, in the estimation of this Witness and some others, must have been an extraordinarily virtuous race; for, in addition to their being believers, they were kind and affectionate parents. And yet these same "affectionate parents" were at one time so given up to idolatry, that they caused their children to pass through the fire to Moloch; and afterwards, when the Testator was before Pilate, they called out, "Let him be crucified"—"His blood be upon us and our children!" Here, then, is positive proof of the word children meaning descendants; for the blood of the crucified Saviour has been upon them for nearly seventeen hundred years. The words of Peter at the Pentecost,—the promise is to you and to your *children*,—are to the same extent; for all persons who have heard them, during that long period, might have enjoyed the promise, if, after the manner of the three thousand, they had repented and been baptized.

"Baptism," says this Witness, "is of the same import to children, as circumcision was to Abraham, or baptism to the eunuch." But, gentlemen, can this be so, when, of all the myriads that have been circumcised, Abraham was the only one we read of that "received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised"?* Have

* Rom. iv. 11.

infants this righteousness of faith? No. But they have no sin; and, consequently, their favourable relation to Christ is, that if they die in infancy, his atonement will not only bring them "again to their own border," but it will exempt them also from "the second death." This Witness must prove that new-born infants have faith, and are able to profess it, before we can admit that baptism is to them of the same import as it was to the eunuch. The eunuch could not stand as an accepted candidate before he had been taught by Philip; nor was it until the former had confessed his faith in the Son of God, that Philip "commanded the chariot to stand still." Then it was that "they went down both into the water;" then it was that the eunuch was baptized; then it was that he was inducted into the church, and afterwards "went on his way rejoicing." Mark, then, the difference which even this Witness himself makes, between the eunuch and an infant? He implies that the former, by being baptized on a confession of faith, became an *actual* member of the Church of God; while he asserts that the latter, by being christened, becomes recognised only as a *formal* member. Formal professors, gentlemen, are hypocrites; consequently, an infant cannot be one. The Fifth Witness has informed you how far the connexion of a christened child extends in respect of the church, but not one of the Witnesses has been bold enough to declare the advantages which the obligation of others to bring it up in the nurture of the Lord would impart, if the child were to die in infancy.

We do not read in the Will that John's baptism gave rise to any objections, further than the Pharisees wondered that he who said, "I am not the Christ," whose appearance they were expecting,* should introduce a new institution. Neither do we read of any converts bringing their children to be baptized of him. But we do read that when the Pharisees and Sadducees came to his baptism, presuming on their descent, he thus addressed them, "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance; and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father; for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."†

This Witness gives us one reason for christening infants which is really unique, *i. e.*, that the introduction of the rite produced no struggle; and that as it excited no controversy, this of itself is presumptive proof of its early antiquity. But, gentlemen, what of

* Luke iii. 15. † Matt. iii. 7, &c.

this? Is the early antiquity of an opinion or practice any proof of its being commanded by the Testator? The worship of the two golden calves was of still earlier antiquity; yet we do not read of that idolatry ever producing a struggle, or exciting any controversy. But this we do read, that Jeroboam "drave Israel from following the Lord, and made them sin a great sin. For the children of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam which he did; they departed not from them, until the Lord removed Israel out of his sight."* And, gentlemen, is there no parallel in the two cases? What have we to do with the time when the ordinance of baptism was first prostituted? Is it not for the Plaintiffs, the men who still prostitute it, to prove that christening was an apostolic doctrine? This, all their Witnesses have attempted, and all have failed; consequently, we are not called upon to refute unfounded statements. And we submit it to you, gentlemen, to declare whether the christening of an infant, for which there is no scriptural authority, is not an idolatrous act; (see (Deut. xii. 32; 1 Sam. xv. 23; Gal. i. 6. 9; 2 John 9—11.) and whether it will not eventually bring upon the perpetrators of it a punishment equal in amount to that which was visited on the followers of Jeroboam?

This Witness presumes the Apostle Peter to have been like himself, unable to surmount first impressions. Peter's impressions were not in favour of any rite being continued to infants; they were in favour of his brethren being still more esteemed than the Gentiles. But, by a wonderful vision, his eyes were opened to see his error. Peter knew, of his own knowledge, that he was a member of the Jewish commonwealth; he had the mark of it in his own person. But not a man among the Plaintiffs can, of his own knowledge, discover that it was ever even pretended to make him a member of Christ. This Witness directly asserts that unless the christened die in infancy, they can have no claim to heavenly happiness; and indirectly, that if they die in infancy, unchristened, they are lost.

"If," says he, "it had been intended to exclude infants from entering into the covenant by baptism, the absence of every prohibitory expression to this effect in the New Testament would be misleading to all men." Allow me, gentlemen, to endeavour to illustrate the fallacy of this mode of reasoning, by a figure drawn from common life. Suppose this Witness had expected a deceased relative or friend to bequeath him a rich legacy, his first business would be to

* 2 Kings xvii. 21—23.

peruse the will. He reads the will, and he finds no mention of his name in it; would this mislead him? No; the omission of his name as sufficiently prohibited him from any benefit, as if the testator had said, I exclude this Witness from entering into possession of any portion of my property.

In conclusion, it would perhaps be well for those who are now endeavouring to destroy the small vestige that remains of the wall of Jerusalem, and who are rejoicing in their work, to study the 25th chapter of Ezekiel; and no longer to argue upon hypotheses, but to bring forward facts—facts worthy the attention of a jury, and the reply of a counsel.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON JOHN III. 23.

"JOHN ALSO WAS BAPTIZING IN ÆNON, NEAR TO SALIM, BECAUSE THERE WAS MUCH WATER THERE; AND THEY CAME AND WERE BAPTIZED."

The FIRST WITNESS observed, that "This [much water] was equally necessary, where such multitudes were baptized, whether the ceremony were performed either by *dipping* or *sprinkling;* but as the Jewish custom required the person to stand in the water, and having been instructed, and entered into a covenant to renounce all idolatry, and take the God of Israel for their God, *then plunge themselves under the water.* It is probable that the rite was thus performed at Ænon."

The FOURTH WITNESS said, "John was called the Baptist, or the Baptizer, because he admitted the Jews into the number of his disciples by the external rite of baptism, as a sign or profession of repentance;...and when they were brought to confess their sins, and to profess repentance, and a purpose of submitting to the Messiah who was at hand, and leading a new life, they were baptized by him *in* or *at* the river Jordan."*

The FIFTH WITNESS; "It is incredible that the multitude whom

* Matt. iii. 1. 5, 6.

John baptized in the wilderness were immersed. Of these, a very great multitude were women. These multitudes certainly came to hear John without having prepared any proper dress in which to be baptized; for they could not even know that he would baptize them. It will not be mistrusted that this promiscuous assembly were immersed naked. To have immersed them with their clothes on would have exposed them to certain disease or death."*

The SIXTH WITNESS; "John baptized '*in* Jordan,'† '*in* the river of Jordan.'‡ Such expressions are inconclusive, for this obvious reason, that they are equally suitable on the supposition of *pouring* having been the mode of baptism, as on that of *immersion*. Had John stood in the water, however shallow, or had he stood in the bed of the river at the water's edge, and poured the water on those who came to him for baptism, the historian not only might have used the same expression with propriety, but could hardly have used another."§

The SEVENTH WITNESS said; "When I read John iii. 22, 23, I see nothing concerning immersion, but a plain reason why two large companies...should...have been attracted to the neighbourhood of each other, where they might act without interference, while separately engaged in making the same religious use of water. 'There were many waters there,' is an expression which appears to me to refer not to Ænon only, but also to the land of Judah, probably the banks of the Jordan, where Christ and his disciples were baptizing."‖

"It is objected," said the EIGHTH WITNESS, that "John was baptizing in Ænon, because there was much water there. Does not this very clearly and certainly imply that he baptized the multitudes by dipping? I apprehend not at all. For there were other necessary and important uses for...'many waters,' besides dipping the multitudes; other weighty and just causes why John should choose this well watered and fruitful country for the scene of his ministrations....Let it be considered how valuable and scarce water was in those parts; how hot the climate; how numerous she crowds which flocked to John's baptism; from how distant parts they came; how

* Vol. 2, page 544. † Matt. iii. 6. ‡ Mark i. 5.
§ Page 172. ‖ Page 157.

long they tarried to hear his doctrine and instructions,—for the mere act of baptizing was the least part of John's mission; and of the people's end of flocking to him: let these be considered, and there will appear sundry good reasons for his choosing this well-watered and fruitful country for the place of his preaching, without any regard had to the convenience of dipping....

"If these multitudes were all dipped, how was it done? Were they naked? This modesty forbids. Had they all change of raiment, to undress, and put on dry apparel, when they came out of the water? This the vastness of the multitudes, the openness of the country, and the great distance whence they came, will not easily admit. And that they stood in their wet garments, and hearkened to John's doctrine, or travelled in them many miles to their homes, seems equally improbable. I pretend to no certainty that John did not dip at all. But as he had seen, by the express appointment of God, water applied both ways to the human body for ceremonial purification, viz., by *sprinkling* and *dipping*,—and both these are, by the Spirit which sent him to baptize, actually called *baptisms*,—it is possible he might use both ways of administration, according as the circumstances of time, place, and persons required....

"If it be said; But that question of the Jews, 'Why baptizest thou then, if thou art not that prophet?' implies there was something new and unprecedented in John's baptism: the answer is obvious: 1. That it could not be by his mere using of the ceremony of baptizing which occasioned this enquiry, because it was confessedly a ceremony perfectly well known and familiar among them. But, 2. It was his using of the ceremony upon the Israelites, or Jewish nation, who looked upon themselves as a people already holy, and in covenant with God; and therefore not to need this ceremony of cleansing, or separation, under which the Gentiles were wont to pass, when received into the church....

"When the people of Judea are said to be baptized of John...'in the river Jordan,' and that Jesus, when baptized, came up out of... 'or' from the water, it will by no means hence follow that they were totally plunged under it. For it being the custom of those countries to wear sandals only on their naked feet, and the washing these being among them a very familiar and delightful thing, the going down into the water to have it poured on their heads is quite natural and likely. So that the arguments drawn hence also in favour of overwhelming will in nowise conclude.

"The laying any weight on its being said, 'were baptized in Jordan,' shows extreme ignorance of the original. For, 1. The word εν, here translated *in*, is in no less than one hundred and fifty places of the New Testament (a learned gentlemen hath observed,) rendered *with*. And had it thus been rendered here, baptized *with* Jordan,—meaning *with* the water of that river,—it would have been a form of speaking, neither more figurative nor improper than is familiar both in scripture and in common life....

"Can it be proved that any person baptized was so much as in the water at all? The putting of this question may appear singular to some, who would be ready to say, Can anything be more evident than this? Did not our Lord come up out of Jordan? Did not Philip and the eunuch go down into, and come up out of, the water? The truth is, that whether they went into the water, or not, depends upon three small words, εις, εκ or εξ, and απο. The two last are used in the New Testament, I suppose a hundred times, to signify from; and the first as often to signify to; and they necessarily signify no more than to the water, and from the water; so here is no proof that any one person was baptized in the water at all."*

The Ninth Witness remarked, "The Immersionists can see no reason for either Jesus or John baptizing where there was 'much water,' but that they plunged their converts. Where could the multitudes who came for baptism be assembled? Clearly not in houses. The preaching was in the fields; and since the rite which was to follow a ministry which made such an impression, and drew together such crowds, was baptism, the necessity of the case must lead the baptists to Jordan, or to some other district, where, if a river was wanting, fountains at least existed. The necessity was equal in this case, whether the mode of baptism were that of aspersion, of pouring, or of immersion.

"The Baptists, however, have magnified Ænon, which signifies the fountain of On, into a place of 'many and great waters.' Unfortunately, however, no such powerful fountain, sending out many streams of water fit for plunging multitudes into, has ever been found by travellers, although the country has been often visited; and certainly if its streams had been of the copious and remarkable character assigned to them, they could not have vanished."†

* Pages 102—109. † Page 439.

The Tenth Witness said, Our opponents tell us that "according to learned authors, Βαπτιζω signifies to dip, and εις signifies into; and then, taking this for granted, all goes on smoothly....In this way the sentiment has received astonishing currency, among common and conscientious men. Deluded with the dogmas of dipping, they never read of John baptizing in Jordan, or in Ænon, near to Salim, because there was much water there, but they immediately think every person who went to hear a sermon by the side of a river, went over the head. It never occurs to them that Judea was a country which was parched with thirst. That John preached in a place proper for accommodating the multitudes which flocked to him from Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan. Such a multitude must assemble in a wilderness, or they would destroy their neighbour's property; and such a multitude, assembled in a wilderness, must have much water to drink, or they would die for thirst. But, I say, these things never occur to them. They think of Judea as if it were Great Britain; and because none baptize by rivers now, but dippers, they think it must have been so then. Thus the pious cheat proceeds without detection, and many good and gracious souls, who cannot read Greek, and who do not remember that John baptized with water, in the same way that the disciples were baptized with the Holy Ghost, are led away with the delusion. Nay, they do not remark, that as such multitudes never flocked to the apostles after our Lord's death, such places were never chosen for their accommodation. After the baptismal statute was given,* I think we only read of one individual who was baptized in any thing like a river. And if the eunuch was really baptized in a river, it was merely for this reason, that it was the first water he came to after he professed his faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.

"I shall honestly acknowledge, that if all the baptisms we read of in the New Testament had been administered in Jordan, or by the side of rivers, I should have thought it a strong circumstance.... But when I read of not one, after the ascension of Christ, that came up from any water, except the eunuch, this last shadow of proof evanishes, like the morning cloud and the early dew."†

---

* Matt. xxviii. 19.

† Pages 39, 41.

In reply to the foregoing testimony of the Witnesses, the Counsel for the Defendants addressed the Jury in the following terms:—

"It is manifest, from the puerile manner in which the Witnesses have given their evidence, and from their discrepancies,—no two of them agreeing,—that they are either ignorant of the meaning of, or are afraid to give you a conscentious opinion on, this clear and important passage. This I shall endeavour to show, by bringing the gist of theirevidence into closer contact.

The First Witness said, "It is probable the converts plunged themselves."

The Fourth, "They were baptized in, or at, the river Jordan."

The Fifth, "It is incredible that the multitudes were immersed."

The Sixth, that the words of the clause are as suitable to pouring upon as to immersion; but not a word of the suitability of *sprinkling*.

The Seventh saw nothing in the clause concerning immersion.

The Eighth pretended to no certainty that John did not dip at all; but thought it possible that he did.

The Ninth said, "The necessity for much water was equal, whether for aspersion, or pouring, or immersion."

The Tenth stated that the land on the border of Jordan was a wilderness; while

The Eighth described it twice over as fruitful.

The Fifth showed himself hardly pressed for an argument, when he affirmed, so contrary to the truth, that being awhile in wet clothes would expose the party to *certain* disease or death.

The Fourth has before told you, that he had arrived at perhaps an unnecessary scrupulousness of conscience—that he could not *do* a thing that his heart disapproves. How, then, can he withhold a thing at variance with his conscience? Can he make you, gentlemen, believe that he could have been three quarters of a year investigating the subject, and not come to a conclusion whether John baptized or rhantized his converts *at* or *in* the river Jordan? Is there not here the same degree of mental reservation as there would be if he were again called to subscribe the thirty-nine articles, provided preferment were offered?

It was said by the Eighth Witness, that the mere act of baptizing was the least part of John's mission. But this may be questioned; for although he had, in the first place, to instruct the Jews into the

character of the Testator, and to exhort them to repentance, it is evident, also, that his mission was to introduce a new institution. What doth John say of it? "That he (Jesus) should be made manifest to Israel; therefore am I come baptizing with water."* And what said the Testator, when John forbad his baptism? "Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness."†

This Witness further said, that John had, by the express appointment of God, seen water applied both ways to the human body for ceremonial purification; viz., by sprinkling and dipping. But can he bring forward a single instance of one individual being dipped by another for that purpose! No. Nor can he prove that the two words were ever used synonymously, for their meaning, as we shall make it manifest, is widely different. "A clean person shall take hyssop, and *dip* it in the water, and *sprinkle* it ... upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave. And the clean person shall *sprinkle* upon the unclean on the third day; ... and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and *wash* his clothes, and *bathe* himself in water."‡ Here, then, we have, in one text, the exemplification and the use of the four words, *dip*, *sprinkle*, *wash*, and *bathe:* but I cannot find that dipping the body was ever appointed of God for purification. Naaman dipped himself in Jordan,§ not ceremonially, to purify himself, but to be miraculously cured of a loathsome disease.

This Witness, gentlemen, is desirous of blinding you, by making it appear that it depends upon the meaning of three small Greek words, whether what is said of Philip and the eunuch going down into, and coming up out of the water, means anything more than "going to and from the water." But it is not necessary for you to be versed in the Greek language, in order to determine this question; because you have it in evidence from an acknowledged classical scholar, whom the Plaintiffs have put in the fore-front of the battle, that the English translation of the Bible contains the very *spirit* and *soul* of the original. In this assertion he does not stand alone, but is supported by the most learned of our opponents. This, then, decides, or at least ought to decide, on the part of the Plaintiffs, the meaning of these three little words, and will save you and me the trouble of future notice, should they again be brought forward.

John was sent by God to baptize with water.‖ And is it not

* John i. 31. † Matt. iii. 14, 15. ‡ Numbers xix. 18, 19.
§ 2 Kings v. 14. ‖ John i. 7. 31.

clearly shown, by the question put to the Jews by the Testator,* that immersion originated with John? Circumcision, under the old dispensation, was the only thing required of either Jew or Gentile, to make him meet to enter into the congregation.† Consequently, the question put by the Pharisees to John, "Why baptizest thou then?" was natural. Why dost thou, vested with no authority,—for by thine own account thou art neither "that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet,"—why dost thou administer a new ordinance? This it was that amazed them; this that they had never before witnessed. The great number that were baptized of John made it evident that the converts believed in what the evangelist Mark said, that it was "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God;"‡ the beginning of a new dispensation, ushered into the world by a new institution.

You recollect, gentlemen, that this Witness had, in his preceding evidence, confined himself solely to the doctrine of pedobaptism; on the subject of the clause now before us, he has not a word to say. He does not venture to bring forward a single argument in favour of it; not a single supposition that John *might* have baptized one solitary infant. Yet from the tenor of his evidence he believes John's baptism to be scriptural baptism; this is obvious, by his mentioning the baptism of the Testator and the eunuch. And does he not, by this part of his evidence, falsify in the most positive manner the title he has given to his publication, which is as follows:—

"Dissertations on Christian Baptism, in which is shown that Anti-pedobaptism is in opposition to The Holy Scriptures, and the *General Practice of the Church of Christ in all Ages.*"

And this is the title of the publication to which eleven of the leading Congregational ministers of the present day have subscribed their names. What reliance, then, can you place on evidence which bears such contradiction on its very face? or what reliance can you place on the evidence of the First and Ninth Witnesses, when they assert that the necessity for "much water" was equal, whether for *sprinkling* or *dipping*, seeing a few tuns of it, as sparingly applied as it is at the present day, would have sufficed to sprinkle every man, woman, and child in Judea. Or on that of the former, who has previously said, "that John's baptism was by plunging the body, as it appears that he baptized in Jordan; that he baptized in Ænon,

* Matt. xxi. 25. † See Exod. xii. 43–49. ‡ Mark i. 1.

because there was much water there; and that Christ, being baptized, came up out of the water? Or on that of the latter, who asserts that if ever there had been much water in Ænon, it must have been there yet; it could not have vanished. Travellers, said he, cannot find it. But I would ask, Can they find the foundation of the temple, laid with materials to defy the effects of time? Can they find the least trace of Jerusalem, as it was when Titus left it; or, can they discover even the exact site on which it stood? He that said, "Zion shall be ploughed like a field, and Jerusalem shall become heaps, and the mountains of the house as the high places of the forest,"* said also, "Thy heaven that is over thy head, shall be brass, and the earth that is under thy feet shall be iron. The Lord shall make the rain of thy land powder and dust: from heaven shall it come down upon thee, until thou be destroyed.;'† How then can they find much water in a land which is still under such a dreadful anathema?

The Tenth Witness taunts us with ignorance of the fact that Judea was a country parched with thirst, and for thinking that Judea was like Great Britain. Had he been familiar with the Will, he would have known that Judea, while the blessing of God rested upon it, was as much superior to Great Britain, as Great Britain is to the most unfruitful country in Europe, for "it was the glory of all lands."‡ If this Witness should be correct in his statements, my clients would be in "evil case," for few of them understand Greek. But, gentlemen, is there no risque "of the good and gracious souls" of his own community being led away by the delusion of christening? Doubtless the majority of them are ignorant of Greek; and consequently, according to him, know no more of the reason why John preached where there was much water, than what he is pleased to tell them.

This Witness acknowledged, that if all the baptisms we read of in the New Testament had been administered in Jordan, or by the side of rivers, he should have thought it a strong circumstance. But when he reads of not one, after the ascension of Christ, that came up from any water except the eunuch, the last shadow of proof evanishes like the morning cloud and early dew. How, gentlemen, let me ask, does it happen, that though once, and only once, it is commanded that all nations should be taught and baptized, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and that though we read

* Mic. iii. 12. † Deut. xxviii. 23, 24. ‡ Ezek. xx. 15.

of no one being so baptized, all sects, even that of this Witness, use these words without a scruple in either affusing or sprinkling; when, more than once, persons are commanded "to repent, to believe, and to be baptized." Yet this the Plaintiffs reject almost to a man. "Is, then, one command, unsupported by a single precedent, sufficient to justify the one; and are sundry commands and precedents, from the same authority, insufficient to justify the other?" Let the Witness and his followers, if they be able, answer this.

We are, gentlemen, clearly and positively told in the Will, that John chose Ænon *solely* for the convenience of baptizing his converts, "because there was much water there;" and none of the Witnesses have dared to deny it. Only two of them ventured to give an opinion of the use made of the water. The Eighth said it is possible John might both have sprinkled with, and dipped in it. This we know, gentlemen, is not the fact, for we are assured there is only *one* baptism (Eph. iv. 5.) And the First said that it is probable each one plunged himself. Mark, gentlemen, this word *probable*. Is this the manner of expression of a man who told us in that box that he had studied the Bible free from bias, solely as a revelation from God to man? Nevertheless it proves that in his opinion the only legitimate use of the "much water" was for the purpose of plunging in.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON JOHN III. 5.

"EXCEPT A MAN BE BORN OF WATER AND OF THE SPIRIT, HE CANNOT ENTER INTO THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN."

THE FIRST WITNESS said, "When John came baptizing with water, he gave the Jews the plainest intimations that this would not suffice, that it was only typical of that baptism of the Holy Ghost, under the similitude of fire, which they must all receive from Jesus Christ.*...Those that" have never had any other baptism than that of water...may "take Jesus Christ's word for it" they cannot, "in their present state, enter into the kingdom of God...It is Jesus *only* who baptizes with the Holy Ghost.† He who receives not this bap-

* Matt. iii. 11. † John i. 33.

tism, has neither right nor title to the kingdom of God, nor can he with any propriety be termed a christian, because that which essentially distinguishes the christian dispensation from that of the Jews, was, that its Author *baptized* all his followers *with the Holy Ghost.*"

The SECOND WITNESS said, "Nicodemus, not rightly understanding Christ's meaning, in the former verse,* our Saviour is pleased to explain himself in this, and tells him that the birth he spoke of was not natural, but spiritual, wrought in the soul by the Spirit of of God, whose working is like water, cleansing and purifying the soul from all sinful defilement...the regenerating change is wrought in the soul by the Spirit of God, which purifies it from its natural defilement, and renews it after the divine likeness and image. We never understand divine truths aright, till Christ opens our understandings; till then they will be denied, nay perhaps derided, even by those who are profoundly learned."†

The THIRD WITNESS said, "I make no scruple of considering the words of our Saviour (John iii. 5,) as indicating the sacrament of baptism, because I believe it to be the doctrine of the Bible, and I am sure it is the doctrine of the Church of England. Agreeable to which I conceive it is the opinion of the generality of the national clergy, that by that sacrament we are made christians, and are born anew of water and of the Holy Spirit; or, that I may express myself in the words of the late apostolical bishop Wilson, that 'regeneration, or new birth, is that spiritual change which is wrought by the Holy Spirit upon any person in the use of baptism, whereby he is translated out of his natural state as a descendant of Adam, to a spiritual state in Christ, that is, to a state of salvation, in which, if it is not his own fault, he will be saved. This doctrine, however, has been virtually at least, if not actually denied; and denied in terms which charge the maintainers of it with blindness and ignorance, with innovating on evangelical truth, with being opposers of the doctrines of the gospel, and patrons of a heathenish superstition.

"As it may be important to prove, beyond the possibility of a suspicion to the contrary, that the accusation which is to be made the subject of our present inquiry, implicates the Church of England, as well as the generality of her ministers, I shall venture to show, by the adduction of several passages in her liturgy, ... that the

* Verse 4. † Page 280.

doctrine of regeneration by baptism is most clearly asserted by her; or, in other words, that 'she supposes, in strict conformity with the scriptures, not merely that all real christians are regenerated by God's Holy Spirit,' by which I understand all those who live a christian life; but that those also are so regenerated who receive baptism rightly, or what, in the case of infants, at least in a christian country, amounts to the same thing, to whom baptism is rightly administered, notwithstanding by their future conduct they may forfeit the privileges of their new birth....

"The office with which I begin is the ministration of public baptism to infants, which the priest, having ascertained that the child has not been baptized, is directed to commence in this form, 'Dearly beloved; forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith, none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost, I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant unto this child that thing which by nature he cannot have, that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and be received into Christ's holy church, and be made a lively member of the same.'... The reason of their being called on so to pray is, 'forasmuch as Christ saith none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew, of water and of the Holy Ghost.' Putting these passages together, what else is the prayer...than a prayer that by baptism he may be born anew.

"Proceeding to the prayers, I do not rest on that general expression in the first, where we pray God to 'wash and sanctify the child with the Holy Ghost,' but going forward to the second, I beg your attention to that passage wherein the priest is directed to say, 'Almighty God, we call upon thee for this infant, that he, coming to thy holy baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration. The passage needs no comment; it will only be recollected that the question is, What does the Church of England understand by our Saviour's expression of being born of water and of the Spirit?' Nor is it necessary to make any other comment on the following extracts, while I point to that prayer where we entreat Almighty God to give his Holy Spirit to the infant about to be baptized, that he may be born again:' to the prayer of consecration, where we entreat him to 'sanctify the water to the mystical washing away of sin, and to grant that the child, now to be baptized therein,

may receive the fulness of his grace, and ever remain in the number of his faithful and elect children:' to the address immediately following the baptismal rite, wherein the priest calls on the congregation to give thanks to Almighty God expressly for this cause, 'seeing that the child is regenerate:' and to the thanksgiving that follows, wherein we are instructed 'to yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to regenerate *this infant* with thy Holy Spirit, and to receive him for thine own child by adoption.' These words must be left to speak for themselves; they admit of no illustration or explanation. Language cannot be plainer.*...

"I am afraid," gentlemen, "of fatiguing and wearing out your patience, by multiplying evidences of what must already be so clear; knowing, however, as I do, and as every one at all acquainted with the state of religion in this country must know, that there are persons who, not content with denying the doctrine of baptismal regeneration themselves, would fain fasten their own private opinion upon the church, and sedulously labour to propagate it as her's; I must solicit your attention whilst I proceed to show by a still greater accumulation of proof, what her doctrine is, and that she does not confine her assertions of it to her baptismal offices, but disseminates it over other parts of her liturgy.

"After being baptized, the first religious duty in which the church requires a child to be engaged is the learning of his catechism; and here, reminding him of the privileges to which he was then admitted, the very first thing that she teaches him is, that in his baptism he was made a member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.†...And being interrogated what is its inward and spiritual grace, he is instructed to answer, a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness; for being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, we are hereby made the children of grace.... Had it been the intention of the composers of the catechism...to assert most unequivocally the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, how could it have been more directly asserted?...

"The next religious office in which the child is engaged, is the order of confirmation, wherein he ratifies and confirms the vows made for him by his sureties at baptism. We have here, then, of course, an allusion to that holy institution; and, as if it were cautiously provided that the sacramental character of the institution

* Pages 9—13. † Page 15.

should be kept steadily in view, we are reminded of the regeneration conveyed by it to the baptized.*...

"From the liturgy, if we direct our attention to the articles of our church, we shall find a perfect harmony maintained about the doctrine in question. In three of the articles (the ninth, fifteenth, and sixteenth) it is incidentally alluded to, in such a manner as to show that the church takes for granted the connexion between baptism and the new birth. ... But that which is more pointedly and more fully to our purpose, is the twenty-seventh article, which expressly sets forth the doctrine of the church concerning baptism....

"Such is the doctrine of our church with regard to regeneration; nor does she consider it as a matter of mere abstract speculation, for in conformity with this, she requires her ministers to instruct the people that 'the baptism of their children ought not to be deferred longer than till the first or second Sunday after their birth, lest importune and unnecessary delay occasion that the child die before it is dedicated to the service of God,'... and reckoned in the account of the second Adam. And she accordingly pronounces what gives to the doctrine that I am maintaining its great practical importance, that 'it is certain, by God's word, that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.'†...

"I have dwelt longer upon this point, and have multiplied proof to a greater extent, than may appear necessary to those who are contented to take the plain declarations of our church in their plain and obvious meaning. To such persons it may be matter of no small astonishment, that one of the founders of Methodism,‡ who uniformly gloried in his fidelity to the doctrines of the Church of England, declared, that 'baptismal regeneration might, with all our best endeavours, be ineffectual;' affirming of himself, that 'though he had used all the means for twenty years, yet he was not a Christian;' and adopting the authoritative language of our Saviour 'Verily, verily, I must be born again.' To such persons it must be matter of astonishment, that the other great leader§ of the schism, himself also a minister of the national church, declared that 'he would as soon believe the doctrine of transubstantiation as that all people who are baptized are born again,' and pronounced that 'baptismal regeneration was the Diana of the present clergy, and of the present age.||...

* Page 16. † Pages 18—20. ‡ J. Wesley. § Whitfield. || Page 22.

"If the work of regeneration is not effected by baptism, it is almost impossible for any sober man to say where, and by what means, it is; and that we are thus left without any other guide than the very questionable criterion of our own imaginations, or our own feelings, to determine whether we are in possession of that which our Saviour has pronounced to be an indispensable requisite of salvation. A situation this of doubt, suspense, and anxiety, with regard to our eternal welfare, to which it is reasonable to believe that, with such a revelation of his will as christianity professes to be, 'the Father of mercies and God of all comfort' would not expose his humble creatures.

"For that I may prosecute a former observation, if spiritual regeneration be not conferred by baptism, when (we may reasonably demand) and by what means is it conferred? In what other ceremony, and at what other season, shall we find that joint operation of water and of the Holy Spirit of which Christ affirms we must be born? I say that joint operation, for surely those which Christ himself hath joined together it is not for man to put asunder.*...

"Upon this point the observation of one of our first and most celebrated reformers is not unworthy of attention: 'Like as Christ was born in rags,' says the venerable Latimer, 'so the conversion of the whole world is by rags; by things which are most vile in this world, for what is so common as water? every foul ditch is full of it, yet we wash out remission of our sins by baptism; for like as he was found in rags, so we must find him by baptism.'†...

"It is the doctrine of the Holy Scriptures, that we are by baptism made heirs of salvation through Christ; and it is the declaration of our Saviour, that we cannot enter into the kingdom of God ... except we be born of water and the Spirit. If, then, we cannot become heirs of salvation except we be born of water and of the Spirit, and if we be made heirs of salvation by baptism, I see not how we are to evade the consequence that the outward washing of baptism is attended by the sanctification of the Spirit, and that we are born of water and of the Spirit, when we are baptized. Thus when our Saviour, on giving his commission to the apostles, to go teach all nations, baptizing them, accompanied it with the promise, that he that believed and was baptized should be saved, it must clearly be understood, that the communication of the Holy Spirit, and spiritual regeneration, were to attend on baptism, which is here expressly represented as the means of salvation.‡...

* Page 25. † Page 26. ‡ Page 29.

"It may be here not unimportant to remark, that as we argue for baptism being the vehicle of regeneration, because it is the vehicle of salvation, to which regeneration is necessary; so also we may come to the same conclusion from this consideration, that all christians, all persons who have been baptized, are indiscriminately said to have been regenerated. In several passages in the epistles of St. Paul, it appears that he applies the term to large societies of believers, especially to the churches of Rome and Colosse. The language which he addresses to Titus upon that subject appears to be at least equally comprehensive; whilst St. Peter and St. John, each in a catholic epistle addressed to immense societies of christians scattered throughout the east, describe the persons whom they address as 'sons of God,' 'begotten, and born again.'* But wherefore, unless their regeneration was the effect of an ordinance of which all christians in general partake? And if so, of what ordinance but of baptism?

"From these several authorities, I apprehend it to be established as a general doctrine of the gospel, that the new birth, or regeneration, which is pronounced by our Saviour to be necessary to salvation, or, as he expresses it, to seeing and entering into the kingdom of God, is effected by the operation of the Holy Ghost at baptism.... Indeed, to deny the regenerating influence of baptism, is to deny its sacramental character, to strip it of that which makes it most valuable, and to reduce it to a mere 'beggarly element,' a form without a substance, a body without spirit, a sign without signification; it is as one sound divine describes it, 'to make it no better than a piece of solemn pageantry;' or, to adopt the comparison of another learned writer, it is 'to make of it an empty shell, whose kernel is taken out; or a carcase whose soul is gone.' Of the folly of this conduct, and of the source from which it proceeds, one of our excellent reformers strongly expressed his opinion, when he said, that 'in all ages the devil has stirred up some light heads to esteem the sacraments but lightly, as to be empty and bare signs;' and of the tendency of this conduct we have a memorable proof in the Calvinistic founder of Methodism,† who deprecated 'disputing about baptism and other non-essentials, as the effect of a narrow spirit, a party, sectarian zeal.' Strip the sacrament of its spiritual character, and we see to what it is avowedly reduced."‡

* 1 John iii. 2; 1 Pet. i. 3. 28. † Whitfield. ‡ Pages 35, 36.

The Fourth Witness said, "Water was used among the Jews in divers washings, or baptisms. John used it in his baptism, and Jesus appointed it in his initiatory sacrament. This was the emblem of that spiritual washing, without which no man can be admitted into the true church as a living member of the same. As baptism in the ordinary course of things is requisite to the outward profession of christianity, so regeneration is invariably necessary to the possession of its privileges and the performance of its duties. 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit,'—except his heart be purified by that inward washing of the Holy Spirit,' of which water has been the constant emblem,—he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. If, under the word water, baptism be especially intended, as that which is the peculiar sacrament of our regeneration, the sentence must be taken as Christ had respect to the general order of the church. Neither yet did he simply bind the grace of God to baptism as if it was absolutely and without any exception necessary; seeing he just after ascribes regeneration to the Spirit, without any mention of water. Thus elsewhere the Spirit and fire are joined, but the order is reversed. 'He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.' Water is really present in the sacrament of baptism, as an outward sign and seal of the spiritual and divine energy which inwardly cleanses us. But fire, when joined to the Spirit, cannot be understood otherwise than metaphorically. In this place, the Spirit being added to water, is a declaration of the external sacramental baptism; in the other, the fire is mentioned as an explanation of the divine energy taken from a corporeal thing. Whatever ignorance of the precept, or mistake about the nature of it, renders not men incapable of baptism by the Holy Ghost, can never render them incapable of the salvation promised to the baptized. It cannot be purely the want, but the contempt of it, which must condemn us. If, however, baptism and being born again be terms of the same meaning, or if the one invariably accompanies the other, so that all who are rightly baptized are regenerate, and none else; then all who die unbaptized, even infants, as well as all others, all over the earth, and in every age of the world, without exception, are shut out of heaven!—a proposition far more dreadful than any held by the most unfeeling and presumptuous supra-lapsarian Calvinist."*

The Fifth Witness; "The regeneration of the scriptures... is

* John iii. 5.

but one thing, and denotes invariably that change of character, or the cause of that change, by which sinners become holy.*...

"The doctrine that baptism is regeneration, that it ensures, or proves that it is attended or followed by it, either regularly or commonly, is erroneous, unfounded, and unscriptural. So far is this from being the doctrine of the scriptures, that according to them adults can never offer themselves for baptism unless already regenerated. The answer of a good conscience, spoken of by Peter, cannot be given by him who is not regenerated...and it is evident that no person who is unregenerated can declare with truth that he renounces Satan, and believes in Christ."†...

"Of this passage (Mark xvi. 16), it is only necessary to observe, that the concluding clause refutes the supposition which the introductory one is employed to support. Here Christ declares, that he who believeth not, whether baptized or not, shall be damned. This could not be true if baptism and regeneration were thus connected.‡...

"It will be sufficient to observe here, that although God has required believing parents to dedicate their children to him in baptism, he has nowhere promised that they shall be regenerated, either in or by the administration of this ordinance. Accordingly a great multitude of the circumcised children of the Israelites, and of the baptized children of christians in every age and church, have plainly lived and died unregenerated.§...

"To be baptized is to be born of water; to be a believer is to be born of the Spirit. He who believeth, whether baptized or not, shall be saved. He that is born of the Spirit, whether born of water or not, shall enter into the invisible kingdom of God. In exact accordance with this construction of the passage, our Saviour, in every other part of his discourse with Nicodemus, insists only on being born of the Spirit, as the great qualification for acceptance with God."||

Cross-examined.—"It is, however, to be observed, that he who, understanding the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, will never enter either the visible or invisible kingdom of God. As he refuses to become a member of the visible, he will certainly be shut out of the invisible kingdom.¶...

"To be born of water, is to be baptized. To be born of the

* Vol. 2, page 515. † Vol. 2, page 516. ‡ Page 515.
§ Page 518. || Page 515. ¶ Vol. 2, page 516.

Spirit, is to be regenerated....The indispensable condition of entering the...visible kingdom is here made by our Saviour baptism. The indispensable qualification for admission into the invisible kingdon is regeneration, the great act of the Spirit of God, which constitutes men real saints. Baptism therefore is here made by Christ a condition absolutely necessary to our authorised entrance into the visible church."*

The Sixth Witness said, "That infant baptism contains a practical testimony from the divine Author of the institution to the necessity of regeneration, is a very different thing from its being regeneration itself, or invariably accompanied by it in its infant subject. The doctrine of baptismal regeneration is, in many respects, as pernicious in its tendencies, as it is absurd on principles of reason, and destitute of foundation in scripture. It is an abuse, for which, as for many others, the ordinance itself is not responsible. The only wonder is that any man of common sense should ever have maintained it. It is a doctrine of the Church of Rome, and it harmonizes well with the innumerable absurdities of that antichristian communion. It is contained also in the articles and baptismal service of the Church of England, constituting one of the remnants of Popery, of which there are too many in the constitution and ceremonies of our Episcopalian Establishment."†

The Seventh Witness said, "Without baptism, as the sign of the covenant of God, we are taught that no one can enter into the kingdom, or enjoy the salvation of God. It corresponds in this respect with what is said Gen. xvii. 14, of circumcision of old. We mean not to assert that baptism is absolutely indispensable to salvation. But certainly there is a meaning not to be despised in the two following passages, in which the ordinance, as well as the blessing it confirms, is expressly mentioned; 'Except a man (any one) be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be *condemned*."‡

The Eighth Witness said, "From our Saviour's own words, Mark x. 14, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." And John iii. 5,

* Vol. 2, p. 514. † Page 180. ‡ Page 207.

'Except any one (τις) is born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' From these two passages, I say, put together, the right of infants to baptism may be clearly inferred. For in one they are declared actually to have a place in God's kingdom, or church; and yet, into this kingdom or church, the other as expressly says, none can be admitted without being baptized.

"The kingdom of God in the gospel denotes either the visible church on earth, or the invisible one in heaven. Answerable to these, there is a twofold regeneration, namely, a being 'born again of water,' *i. e.*, baptism, which is therefore called the 'washing of regeneration,' which admits into the visible church; and a being 'born again of the Spirit,' (called the renewing of the Holy Ghost,) which admits into the invisible. Now in which soever of these senses the expression is here taken, it strongly concludes for the baptism of infants. For,

"1. If by 'the kingdom of God' be meant the visible church on earth, our Lord, by saying 'of such is the kingdom of heaven,' declares that infants are to be considered as having a place in this kingdom; *i. e.*, as being members of that body, society, or church, which he as the Messiah came to rule and to save. But if they are to be considered as a part of this kingdom, or visible church, they are then to be baptized, or born again of water, for this is the only appointed rite of entering into it. Or,

"2. If by 'the kingdom of God' we understand the invisible church in heaven, into that infants cannot enter, except they are born again of the Spirit; *i. e.*, regenerated, quickened, and raised from the dead. But if they are capable and proper subjects of a regeneration by the Spirit, they must be also of baptism; for the baptismal water is nothing else but the appointed token or emblem of this regenerating Spirit. Seeing, then, that God grants them the thing signified, viz., 'the renewing of the Holy Ghost,' it can never be thought his will that the sign or token be denied them, viz., 'the washing of regenration,' or baptism.

"The argument, then, is conclusive, in whatever sense we take the kingdom of God. For our Lord, having in one place declared that the little children should be brought to him, because of such is the kingdom of heaven, and in another, that except any one is born of water, baptized, he cannot enter into this kingdom, it most evidently follows, that infants are capable of being born again of water, or baptized; because, else, they could not enter into this

kingdom, into which our Lord here expressly declares they *do enter*, and are admitted."*

The NINTH WITNESS said, "If then our Lord declares that no one can enter into that church but by being born of water and of the Holy Spirit, which heavenly gift followed baptism when recevied in truth, he clearly makes baptism the mode of initiation into his church.†...

"In several respects baptism, as a *sign* of the new covenant, corresponds to circumcision. Like that, its administration is a constant exhibition of the placability of God to man; like that, it is the initiatory rite into a covenant which promises pardon and salvation to a true faith, of which it is the outward profession; like that it is the symbol of regeneration, the washing away of sin, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost; and like that it is a sign of peculiar relation to God, christians becoming, in consequence, 'a chosen generation, a peculiar people,' his 'church' on earth, as distinguished from 'the world.' 'For we,' says the apostle, 'are the circumcision;' we are that peculiar people and church now, which was formerly distinguished by the sign of circumcision."‡...

Baptism "conveys also the present blessing of Christ, of which we are assured by his taking children in his arms and blessing them; which blessing cannot be merely nominal, but must be substantial and efficacious. It secures, too, the gift of the Holy Spirit, in those secret spiritual influences by which the actual regeneration of those children who die in infancy is effected, and which are a *seed of life* in those who are spared to prepare them for instruction in the word of God, as they are taught it by parental care, to incline their will and affections to good, and to begin and to maintain in them the war against inward and outward evil, so that they may be divinely assisted, as reason strengthens, to make their calling and election sure."§...

The Witnesses having again left the box, the Counsel for the Defendants addressed the jury, saying—

* Pages 31—33.
† Page 399.
‡ Page 405.
§ Page 428.

Gentlemen, you must have remarked, by the vague and contradictory statements you have just heard, that the Witnesses are not familiar with the bearing of the passage on which they have given evidence. It is clear there can be no benefit in the act of christening, unless there be a virtue in the water; and were that the case, the water would have the same beneficial effect upon a man baptized in his sins as mineral waters have on a man diseased, faith being no prerequisite to his cure. The sole utility of water is the being baptized publicly in it, as that is the only appointed ordinance by which a believer can, in the first instance, profess allegiance, and enter into the service of his King. In fact, it is the commission which authorises him to put on the royal uniform, and take his place in the heavenly ranks. Independent of this commission, it remains to be proved, if any individual has been received among them since the great Captain led the way to eternal glory.* For no man can be a follower of Christ who does not confess him in the way he himself has appointed.†

It is, gentlemen, the fitness for the service, not the oath of allegiance, that makes a good soldier; for if he is afterward found unworthy, or unfit for it, he is dismissed with ignominy. So with an unbeliever who should dare to be baptized; he places himself in a worse situation than he was before, because to his other sins he adds that of a false profession. But an infant is as incapable of serving the heavenly King as it is of serving an earthly monarch. Oh but, say the Plaintiffs, did not the heavenly King take little children in his arms, and bless them? He did: and can these Witnesses prove that the children received any spiritual benefit? Put the question to them, gentlemen, and they will acknowledge that even if they did receive any, it was contingent on their dying in a state of innocency.

Regeneration, gentlemen, is independent of contingency. It is to be brought forth into a new kingdom — it is to partake of a new nature — it is to enjoy a new life — it is wholly spiritual, heavenly, and divine — it is to be born of incorruptible seed, "by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever."‡ And the seed being inwardly sown, does in its season germinate, and when the recipient of it is baptized in water, the plant becomes manifest,§ and "God giveth the increase."‖

* Luke xiv. 26, 27. † John xii. 26, xiv. 21, xv. 14, Matt. xix. 28.
‡ 1 Peter i. 23. § Rom. vi. 5, Col. ii. 12. 13. ‖ 1 Cor. iii. 7.

Gentlemen, I am not aware that we have any information respecting the future state of those who die in infancy, except that which is contained in Jer. xxxi. 15, 17. "Thus saith the Lord, a voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping. Rahel weeping for her children, ... because they were not. Thus saith the Lord, Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears; for thy work shall be rewarded, saith the Lord, and they shall come again from the land of the enemy. And there is hope in thine end, saith the Lord, that thy children shall come again to their own border." This border cannot be the land of Canaan, seeing that it was prophetically spoken of such as should die in infancy. And therefore, their being released from the land of the enemy, and coming again to their own border, can only be understood of their being raised up again to life, and to a state of innocency, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ. This is sufficient to convince us that they will be eternally happy; but in what their state of happiness will differ from that of the glorified saints, is not revealed, and it is, therefore, not for us to speculate on the subject; we ought to rest satisfied with what God hath been pleased to make known. That the words spoken by the prophet had relation to infants is put beyond doubt, since the fulfilment of the prophecy is related in Matt. ii. 17, 18.

Now, gentlemen, allow me for a moment to digress, and ask, Does not the former text analogically show that where it is said to the Jews, "I will bring them into their own land," as in Ezek. xxxiv. 13, 16; xxxvi. 24—38; xxxvii. 12—14, 21—28; xxxix. 27, 29, and as in other texts, it is to be understood metaphorically also, *i. e.* into a land of gospel rest and enjoyment, which is the antitype of the land of Canaan and all its earthly blessings? For are we not told by Paul, that there is now no distinction of character, nor of nationality, among those who have been (or shall be) baptized into Christ?* Therefore when the Jews shall be blessed, according to the texts which I have quoted from Ezekiel, their ancient distinguishing name will be laid aside, being merged in that of christian,† or retained as expressive of Christ's people, whether of Heathen or Jewish extraction.‡ And in whatever land they may be found at the time of their calling, there will be their true spiritual rest in Christ. But if, in accordance with the general opinion of the day, the Jews are, after their calling, to be gathered in their former character, round about

* 2 Cor. v. 16, 17; Gal, iii. 27—29; Eph. ii. 14; Col. iii. 11.
† Acts xi. 26. ‡ Rev. ii. 9.

the literal Jerusalem, it would be an actual denial of what Paul tells the Corinthians, the Galatians, the Ephesians, and the Colossians; and of what Micah prophesied.* And it would be also a superseding of the new covenant, and the re-establishing of the old one. At present, both the Jews and the land of Canaan are alike polluted, ruined, and undone; so is the greatest portion of the earth, and the inhabitants upon it. Nevertheless, the whole world† shall alike, at the appointed time, "rejoice and blossom as the rose;"‡ according as it is said, "In that day shall Israel be the third with Egypt and Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land; when the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt my people, and Assyria the work of my hands, and Israel mine inheritance."§

Gentlemen, it is by grace, through faith, and not through innocency of character, that we are made meet for the enjoyment of eternal glory. Had Adam never fallen, he would not have stood in need of a Saviour. Nevertheless, he would not have been entitled to more than simple earthly blessings; for, so far as we are informed, nothing of a higher nature was either revealed or promised to him. Still, from the tenor of the scriptures, we must presume that if he had not violated the law of God, the Son of Man would, as "God manifested in the flesh," have appeared on the earth;‖ otherwise the love of the Father, whose intention it was to reveal it by his well-beloved Son, must have been for ever "hid in God,"¶ and withheld from the experience of man. It is true, in this case, he would not have come as the Redeemer or the Deliverer of his people, or as the ransom for them, for he was not the "Lamb slain," until man had sinned.** But he would have come as the first-begotten of God;†† "the first-born among many brethren;"‡‡ "the author and finisher of our faith;"§§ "the way, the truth, and the life."‖‖ Otherwise, the mighty gift of the Father would, speaking after the manner of men, have been a reward bestowed on disobedience; and to suppose for a moment that Immanuel would not have appeared, would (I speak it with humility,) argue an injustice on the part of the Jehovah, in granting such an unspeakable favour to disobedience, which it was not his intention to have granted to obedience: thus making sin a blessing. But "the Lord is righteous in all his ways."¶¶

* Mic. ii. 10. † Isa. xi. 9. ‡ Isa. xxxv. 1, 2. § Isa. xix. 24, 25.
‖ See Eph. i. 4—6; 2 Tim. i. 9; 1 Pet. i. 20. ¶ Eph. iii. 9—12; Matt. xi. 27.
** Rev. xiii. 8. †† Heb. i. 6. ‡‡ Rom. viii. 29. §§ Heb. xii. 2.
‖‖ John xiv. 6. ¶¶ Ps. cxlv. 17.

The expression, gentlemen, born of water, in the passage before us, I now (contrary to the opinion I once expressed elsewhere,) understand to have a figurative allusion to baptism. See Col. ii. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 21. For although real water cannot make a man a new creature, it is a means of bringing a believer into a new state. For as the new birth is figurative,—see 1 Pet. i. 23,—so I presume is the water here. Water, which under the old dispensation was used to cleanse ceremonially, is in this passage used to represent the word, which now cleanses positively. This is clearly shown in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians; "that he might sanctify and cleanse it (the church,) with the washing of water by the word."* Also by our Lord, "Now ye are clean through *the word* that I have spoken unto you;"† and also by Peter, "As new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the word, that ye may grow thereby."‡ It is the written word of God, made clear to our understanding by the operation of the Spirit, that brings us to a knowledge of himself; and by this word, and through this operation, we are prepared to enter by the ordinance of baptism into the Church of Christ, and are thus "made meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light."§ For it is by this word alone that the saving knowledge of the Father and the Son is conveyed; and by the Spirit operating with the word, "the eyes of our understanding are opened," the affections are drawn out towards God, and the word finds access to the mind. Thus "the light and the power are united, for the one never operates without the other."

Notwithstanding, this first operation of the Spirit, or the beginning of life, previous to baptism, is not that which was promised of the Father, Acts i. 4, the latter being the consummation of life.‖ Baptism in water is a manifestation of being born of the word, of passing from death to life, of quitting the kingdom of this world, and entering into the kingdom of God. It is also a manifestation of the "washing of regeneration."¶ But to be born of the Spirit is a reality, which, according to the Will, no one can experience until he has been literally baptized with water. A careful consideration of the passages which I shall now read, will satisfy you that this view of the case is irrefragable. See Matt. iii. 11; Acts i. 5; ii. 38; viii. 16, 17; xix. 5, 6. And this was manifested in the instance of our Lord, as we read Matt. iii. 16, 17. From the following

* 2 Eph. v. 26. † John xv. 3. ‡ 1 Pet. ii. 2.
§ Col. i. 12. ‖ John x. 10. ¶ Titus iii. 5.

passages also, it is undeniable that the Spirit of truth operates with greater power after baptism, than he does before. See Matt. xxviii. 20; Mark xvi. 17; John xvi. 12, 13; Acts ii. 4; xix. 6.

Now, gentlemen, compare John iii. 5, with Mark xvi. 16. This says, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved;" that, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And say, if the true scriptural import of these texts is not the same? One shows "the way of salvation" positively; the other, negatively. Is it not evident, then, from these two texts, that baptism is *essential* to salvation? And may not the water which the believer passes through be deemed "the water of separation" between the world and the kingdom of God, and between his former sins and himself?*

Thus we see, gentlemen, that what all the Witnesses, except the Second, have said on this text, is foreign to it. Nevertheless, as it has been the means of drawing out more of their sentiments on this important ordinance, their evidence must not pass unnoticed.

The First Witness plainly infers that christening a child causes no alteration in its state. Indeed, how can it? An infant can have no other baptism than that of water. Being incapable of believing, it is therefore incapable of receiving the Spirit. Consequently, he shuts out of the kingdom even christened infants; thus bringing upon himself the deserved reprobation of the Fourth Witness, as holding the unfeeling doctrine of the supra-lapsarian Calvinist: and what is still more strange, he avows that they cannot with any pro priety be *termed christians*, although he has previously asserted that we in this country are born christians. However, he has in this part of his evidence pointed out to the Court how the word baptize applies to two administrations essentially different. In one, as he before told you, literal baptism is plunging the body under water; in the other, metaphorical baptism is the inward reception of the Holy Spirit. One is a visible and outward action, which he informs you will not suffice; the other is a secret influence, which, according to the scriptures,† can only be known to the individuals who are blessed with it. For "the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."‡

The remark of the Second Witness is just: "We never understand divine truths aright till Christ opens our understanding." I

* Rom. vi. 3—7; also John xii. 24.

† See 1 Cor. ii. 10, 11.

‡ 1 Cor. ii. 14.

am therefore bold to assert, and assert it advisedly, that no man, having his understanding so opened, can be a party to the christening of an infant, because he can bring no proof from the Will of its being either sanctioned or commanded, either by the Testator or by his apostles. Does not his remark on the profoundly learned apply to all the Witnesses, himself included?

As the Third Witness deemed it necessary to apologise for taking up so much of your time, I must be more concise. And as extracts from the Prayer-book were the chief proofs he brought forward in favour of baptismal regeneration, I shall begin by casting them into the depths of the sea, as fit companions for apostolic tradition; for like it, they cannot in this Court be received as evidence. The prayer-book, gentlemen, is the work of men, aye, and the greater portion of it the work of men whom a number of the clergy of the present day denounce as little better than servants of "Mystery Babylon;" and yet these very clergy regard and quote it, as of equal authority with the Will itself. Well, gentlemen, though it does not prove baptismal regeneration to be the doctrine of the gospel, it proves it to be the doctrine of the Church of England, and a doctrine that implicates not only all her ministers, but every man and woman who attends that church. Whatever any of her clergy or her congregations may say to the contrary, while the one continues to christen infants, and the other to bring them to be christened; while the one continues to read the baptismal service, and the other to hear it read, they publicly declare themselves parties to that doctrine; and they have no other way of convincing the world that they are not its supporters, but by following the advice of the apostle Paul, 2 Cor. vi. 17.

I entreat your special attention, gentlemen, to what I am about to read to you; it is extracted from a volume said to be issued from the office of the Church and State Gazette, entitled "Tracts for the Last Days."* "One of the worst consequences of the evangelical system is, the position of dishonesty into which, of necessity, it puts those of the clergy, and there are many who maintain it. Whatever may be their mental reservation on the subject, they stand before men as the ministers of that church whose orders they bear, and whose emoluments they receive; and they are bound in all conscience to teach her faith, and conform to her ordinances. If, therefore, they shall say, that they do not believe that they receive the Holy Ghost by the imposition of the bishop's hands, in their ordi-

* Vol. i., pages 272, 276.

nation — that the form of absolution prescribed in the office of the visitation of the sick is presumptuous and blasphemous — that baptism is not regeneration; if they will not teach children of their flock the doctrine contained in the catechism, that in their baptism they were made 'members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven'—if they will neither consider rubrics as of any force, nor the rule and authority of bishops, whom they have sworn to obey in things spiritual, as binding, and yet will continue in the bosom of the church, whose formularies they set at nought, and whose faith in so many instances they contemn, they cannot escape the charge of dishonesty.

"We have a right generally to demand from the bishops, that they do not suffer the pulpits of the Church of England to be used in the denial of her rites, in the contradicting of her doctrines, in the setting at nought of her bishops, and the attacking the sacraments of the catholic church. We have a right to demand that the chaplains of the Queen be not permitted to preach against that church of which the Queen is the acknowledged head."

When this Witness says that the doctrine "has been virtually at least, if not actually denied," he referred, doubtless, to a portion of the national clergy. If so, does it not appear strange, that one party should accuse the other of being "patrons of a heathenish superstition," while both continue by their practice to uphold the doctrine on which the accusation is founded. "I," says one of the accusers, "do not much prize our church catechism. It begins so very ill, calling baptism our new birth, and making us thereby members of Christ, children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven. ...All carnal churchmen fancy they are new-born, because baptized, and quote the catechism as a proof of it; and the carnal clergy preach accordingly, and quote the same authority. The acting of sponsors is now become a mere farce, and a gossipping business; and to promise for infants what they cannot engage for themselves, may suit a covenant of works, but not a covenant of grace."* My learned friend has also accused the Protestant Church of much superstition, in holding baptismal regeneration.

Gentlemen, I am at a loss to know how it is that the opponents of baptismal regeneration can denominate that doctrine "heathenish superstition." The superstition of the heathen is of a very different and far less dangerous character, than is the superstition of those

* Rev. John Berridge, A. M., late Fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, and Vicar of Everton.

who denominate themselves christians; the former arising from the lack of the gospel, the latter from resisting it. The grossest superstition of the heathen, therefore, even the immolation of themselves to Moloch, we may conclude, is not so offensive to God, so obnoxious to his displeasure, as is the act of our opponents; who pretend to be guided by the Will, yet not only change his ordinance, but prostitute it, by administering it to subjects who are unconscious of its nature.*

Baptism, according to the twenty seventh article of the Church of England, which this Witness quotes, is "a mark of difference, whereby christian men are discerned from others that be not christened." How this can be is a marvel, since all the world can testify that it is no mark of distinction whatever, except for an excess of dissipation and of sabbath desecration, to which churchmen are more addicted than any other of our opponents. Besides, gentlemen, how many infants of the Church of England, in the present day, have either had baptism administered to them, or, according to her liturgy, have received it, "rightly"? Not one! Her imperative command is, to dip the child, if it "may well endure it; if not, to pour water upon it." But neither the rule nor the exception is attended to. By the showing of this Witness, therefore, all the children of the Establishment, dying in infancy, depart unregenerate, and consequently, according to him, under condemnation; for to none of them "is baptism rightly administered." But, happily, the eternal well-being of those who do not live to commit sin, whether they depart christened or unchristened, is alike secure.†

It is a common saying, gentlemen, that when friends quarrel the truth transpires. Hence we are told, that the great founder of Methodism affirmed of himself, that although he had used all the means for twenty years he was not a christian. And again, that the other great leader of the schism declared, that "baptismal regeneration" was the Diana of the present clergy. It is not for us to say, with Demetrius, that by this craft they have their wealth; but we have good authority for saying, that none of them can obtain a *living* previous to subscribing to it. But what would Whitfield say, if he were here, and were informed, that (as reported in the Leeds Mercury) one of the popular clergy of the day, a vicar, and one of the chaplains of our gracious Queen, when requested by the churchwarden, at the conclusion of "the communion service," to

* See Isa. xxiv. 5, 6; Jer. vi. 19; and Luke xii. 47, 48. † Rom. iv. 15.

return to him the wine that remained, instead of pouring it on the floor, replied, "*I cannot return you the blood of Christ*"? Or if he had read, in the "Tracts for the Last Days," that "God raised up the authors of the 'Tracts for the Times,' to recal the attention of the church to the wholesome catholic principles and practice which she enjoyed, before protestantism first, and since evangelicalism, despoiled her"? Or if he had heard (as is reported in the London Courier, 27th December, 1837) that the Archbishop of Canterbury, on one occasion, in the House of Lords, admitted that the Roman Catholic Church very closely resembled the Church of England? Or if he had heard a bishop declare, that the Catholic Church was the same as the Protestant, only altered in features? Might he not with propriety say to this Witness, in the words of Mr. Shiel, M. P., as spoken in the House of Commons, "Your religion is only Popery cut down; from whose ecclesiastical escutcheon your own, with a bar sinister, might be appropriately borrowed"?

The admission of his grace the Archbishop appears correct: for, according to Hallam, "The chief points of distinction are the following:—

"1. The liturgy was translated into the vernacular language of the people: formerly it had been in an unknown tongue.

"2. Its acts of idolatrous worship to saints and images were expunged.

"3. Auricular confession was done away; or rather, it was left to every man's discretion, and went into neglect.

"4. The doctrine of transubstantiation, or the change at the moment of consecration, of the substances of bread and wine into those of Christ's body and blood, was discarded.

"5. The celibacy of the clergy was done away.

"With these modifications, the religion of Rome became that of the Church of England. And to this day her ritual, crudely formed in the infancy of Protestantism, which Milton denominates 'an extract of the mass translated,' continues, with little variation, to be the liturgy of the whole episcopal church, in England and America. Like the ancient liturgies, it was prepared for a priesthood who were too ignorant to conduct religious worship with decency without it."*

That person, gentlemen, gives no proof of being regenerated, who

* See A Church without a Prelate, by Lyman Coleman, author of the Antiquities of the Christian Church, page 95.

can ask the question, "If regeneration be not conferred by baptism (christening), when and by what means is it conferred?" For an answer to the question, I shall refer the enquirer to Acts ii. 37—47, and Col. ii. 12, 13; and, in my turn, ask him the following question:—In the event of an infant, soon after it had been christened, being carried into a foreign land, or even to a distant part of his own country, and his parents dying without informing him when and where he had been regenerated, how would he discover the secret? This is no extreme case, gentlemen, but an every day one. I have myself been christened,—at least I have been so informed,—but when, or where, or whether in public or in private, I cannot tell; neither have I any recollection of my sponsors calling upon me to hear sermons, nor providing that I should learn the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments; nay, not even of their names. Now, if I were a churchman, and were desirous to know assuredly that I had been, according to the rubric, regenerated, how should I convince myself of it? I might, it is true, refer to the parish register; but even where that is to be found I know not. Yet this I know, there is not a man upon earth, who stands in doubt whether he be regenerate or not, but could, if he would honestly ask himself the question, and answer it as honestly, convince himself that he is not; because the believer can say, with Paul, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day."*

You would doubtless conclude, gentlemen, that this Witness was very hard pushed for an argument, when he had recourse to the venerable Latimer, to prove that the conversion of the world is effected by rags and dirty water. What gross and base substitutes for the gospel of Christ, and the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit! And how ungrateful of the aged bishop to denominate one of the first blessings of life most vile, merely because our Creator favours us with a bountiful supply of it. But even bishops are not of one accord. An ancient one affirms, that water out of any dirty ditch can wash away sin; while some modern ones act as if it required a particular sort of water, even the water of the river Jordan. But whence came the information that the Lord of life and glory was born in rags? He came into the world as every other child has come; and if his swaddling clothes were not of the finest, they were

* 2 Tim. i. 12.

suitable to the manger in which he was laid; and both were well adapted for the purpose intended — to give to the great ones of the earth the first lesson of humility, which those that live in palaces have yet to learn.

The more this Witness attempts to prove his statement, the more he becomes entangled. To show that we are made heirs of salvation by baptism, he quotes Mark xvi. 15, 16, a passage which has no reference whatever to infants. Can infants be taught? Can they believe, or of their own free will be baptized? Can they come into condemnation on account of their incapacity; or receive remission of sins, who have never committed sins? No! Who but those that christen them, or those that cause them to be christened, would dare to assert, or even to imply, that they will be lost unless some of their fellow creatures, and those under condemnation themselves, should become sureties for them? What natural man, in possession of his senses, would in any case apply to an insolvent to become surety for one whom those most conversant with his circumstances know to be solvent?

But how does it happen, gentlemen, that this Witness misquotes the promise thus — He that believ*ed* and *was* baptized *should be* saved? Is it possible that he could have misquoted it either ignorantly or inadvertently? What he means us to understand by it we leave it to himself to explain.

If a child die unchristened, it cannot, according to him, be "reckoned in the account of the second Adam;" consequently, it must be lost. And this is clearly implied in his declaration, "that it is certain by God's word that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved." But does not this his declaration further imply, that if they live to commit sin, their christening is a useless ceremony? How, then, by his own showing, can they "ever remain in the number of the elect"?

Baptism, says this Witness, is expressly represented as *the* means of salvation. But this is incorrect; "For by grace are" we "saved, through faith, and that not of" ourselves, "it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast."* Nevertheless, it is by means that the Lord sees good to save his people. Thus he has made baptism, on a profession of faith, *a* means† by which his people escape from threatened danger, and get safely into his church. So Paul, previously to his shipwreck, told the people that the Lord

* Ephes. ii. 8, 9. † 1 Peter iii. 21.

had given to him the lives of all that were on board; yet when the extremity of danger arrived, he told the passengers that unless the seamen abided in the ship, they could not be saved. Showing, that although the promise was absolute, yet the seamen were made a means of perfecting it, by running the vessel into the only place where the whole could have escaped the danger, and got safe to land.*

Gentlemen, it was, those that had been baptized in faith, whom the apostles addressed as sons of God; as begotten, and born again, not by or through baptism only, but by "the resurrection of Jesus Christ."† Those are the persons who are indiscriminately addressed as the regenerated; the persons who, after being baptized, had received the Spirit of God. We have no proof in the New Testament of any infants being christened in the days of the apostles. But if there had been any, we have proof enough to satisfy us that they would not have been classed with the sons of God. Baptism is the action whereby every believer ratifies the confession which he makes with his mouth. That it is requisite to salvation, is a very different thing from its being *the* means of salvation. And when it is administered in the belief that the mere act is followed by regeneration, it is indeed "*a shell without a kernel*," and becomes worse than "a beggarly element;" it is doing despite to the spirit of the ordinance.

I trust, Gentlemen, I have proved to your satisfaction that the term "water," in this text, is substituted for "the word." It will not be necessary, therefore, to detain you with any lengthened remarks on the evidence of the Fourth Witness. One or two points, however, require attention. "Fire," said he, "when joined to the Spirit, cannot be understood otherwise than metaphorically." Yet fire, in the text he quotes,‡ like water in the text now under consideration, is, in Jer. xxiii. 29, metaphorically used for, or compared to, the word. Again; he said, "the Lord did not simply bind the grace of God to baptism, as if it was absolutely and without exception necessary." Why then did he subscribe to the contrary declaration as implied in the rubrics? And why assert that the water was the "emblem of that spiritual washing, without which no man can be admitted into the true church"? Who will be hardy enough to name the exception, that would be approved by Him who said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"? If he

* See Acts xxvii. † 1 Peter i. 3. ‡ Matt. iii. 11.

who declared the end from the beginning made the rule positive, who shall dare to infringe it? I have already shown the result of the Establishment allowing an exception, in what she calls the "baptismal service;" and may we not presume that if the Testator had allowed any exceptions to his commission, the result would be the same. "Positive institutes must be regulated by positive laws." People are generally too apt to say that there are many circumstances under which it would be impossible for a person to be baptized; and that we must not limit the Almighty. But they forget that he who sent the apostles to baptize all nations, not only foresaw every circumstance that lay before them, but saw none to prevent his commission being fulfilled. Therefore should any such circumstance apparently arise now, we must attribute the exclusion from the privilege to something unknown to us, or to some previous fault or neglect of the individuals themselves, and not to the Testator. See Prov. i. 20—33.

Now, gentlemen, as we have the clearest evidence that it is the goodness of God that leads men to repentance;* and that faith also is the gift of God;† is it not therefore a sign of a rebellious spirit to imagine, or to assert, that He who hath the power to take away the stony heart from man, and to replace it by a heart of flesh,‡ has not power to furnish him with the same means of confessing his Redeemer as in the case of the eunuch.§ Whatever obstacles may be in the way, he can still turn the hearts of his people to receive him, as he did those of Ananias, and of Cornelius and his friends, as recorded in Acts ix. 10—15, and xi. 17. Are we to imagine that there is anything too hard for the Lord?‖ or that he is able to bring to the birth, and not able to "cause to bring forth"?¶ Or that he who has begun a good work, is not able to finish it?** Has he not said, "I will work, and who shall let it"?†† To deny him this power, would indeed be to limit "the Holy One of Israel."

I have heard it publicly asserted that baptism is not essential to salvation, because there might arise instances where the Testator's command, "This do in remembrance of me," could not be obeyed. But what weight is there in the assertion? For if baptism is not essential to salvation, our Lord's declaration, according to Mark xvi. 16, is void of meaning. It is difficult to discern the difference

* Rom. ii. 4. † Eph. ii. 8. ‡ Ezek. xi. 19. § Acts viii. 29—39.
‖ Gen. xviii. 14; Jer. xxxii. 27. ¶ Isa. lxvi. 9.
** Phil. i. 6. †† Isa. xliii. 13.

between asserting that baptism is not essential to salvation, and asserting that there is another way of salvation besides that of believing and being baptized—besides that of showing our love to the Testator by keeping his commandments.* We allow that man, who is master of what he undertakes, is able to carry out his plans, and shall we deny to man's Creator the same ability?

But although faith in Christ, and an open profession of it in baptism, is now the *only* revealed way of salvation, it by no means follows that it can affect those who lived previous to the commission being published, or that infants, because they are incapable of faith, should be shut out from eternal happiness. Neither does it follow that the inhabitants of those lands on which the glorious light of the gospel has not yet shone should, for lack of faith, come under condemnation.† Still, let no one who has the Will in his hands, and can read it, flatter himself, should he take a wrong view of it, that he will hereafter be allowed to plead ignorance of its requirements; for "the way of holiness" is so plain, that "the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."‡ Neither let him who lives in the neglect of it during the period of health and strength, refusing to yield obedience until he is brought to a dying bed, expect that his cries will then be heard.§ "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."‖ When confession is genuine, the baptism of the Spirit follows the baptism in water as certainly as the day succeeds the night.¶ And we have only one positive instance of the former preceding the latter, *i. e.*, that of Cornelius, unless we include that of Paul, which is not quite so "manifestly declared."

Gentlemen, we believe that all infants, "of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation," together with all persons who are incapable of knowing good and evil, will, when they die, be for ever happy. Therefore it must be the church of which this witness is a member,—the church which refuses to unchristened innocents what it calls "christian burial,"—which holds the unfeeling supra-lapsarian doctrine he so severely and deservedly condemns. Do not the rubrics which he has sworn to maintain imply that unbaptized children will be lost? and if they do not more than imply it, the

* John xiv. 21. † See Rom. ii. 12—16. ‡ Isa. xxxv. 8.
§ See Prov. i. 20—23; Eccl. xii. 1—6. ‖ John iii. 19.
¶ Isa. xliv. 3; Joel ii. 27, 32; Matt. iii. 11; Luke xi. 13; Acts ii. 38; 1 Cor. xii. 13.

heading of the burial service must be understood in some other than its ordinary sense. Nay, does he not infer it himself, by saying that "he is fully satisfied that the infant children of believers are the proper subjects of baptism?" If these be the only children that are proper subjects of baptism, it doubtless follows, according to his own statement, that they are the only children capable of being saved; otherwise, where is the utility of the rite?

The evidence of the Fifth Witness is directly opposed to that of the Third. The former asserts, that "the doctrine that baptism is regeneration is erroneous, unfounded, and unscriptural," and that "no adult can scripturally offer himself for baptism unless already regenerated;" "although," he says, "God has required believing parents to dedicate their children to him in baptism, he has nowhere promised that they shall be regenerated thereby." What, then, it may again be asked, is the object of the rite? and why did he not give scriptural authority for the requirement? On the one hand he informed us, that "he who believeth, whether baptized or not, shall be saved;" on the other, that "he who, understanding the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, will never enter either the visible or the invisible kingdom of God," From this we must infer that a man may believe "to the saving of the soul," and yet be ignorant of the requirements of the gospel. But that he who knows the gospel, and does not attend to its requirements, will be lost. The latter is true, but the former is impossible; for the gospel is the power of God to salvation.*

Although there is no connexion between baptism and regeneration, as respects the baptism of an unbeliever or of an infant, yet there is such a connexion between the baptism and regeneration of a believer, that no unbaptized person can be scripturally reckoned among the regenerated,† nor, according to the gospel, can he have a well-grounded hope of his eternal safety.‡ It is written, (1 John ii. 29,) "Every one that doeth righteousness is born of him (God);" and who, in the true scriptural sense of the words, can do righteousness, previously to being baptized?§ Does not our Lord identify himself with his followers, when he says, "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness"?

This Witness assumes that, according to the scriptures, none can offer himself for baptism, unless he be already regenerated; and then he asserts, that to be born of the Spirit is to be regenerated.

* Rom. i. 16. † Col. ii. 12, 13. ‡ Mark xvi. 16. § Matt. iii. 15.

Well then, gentlemen, is it not self-evident that none can now be born of, or be baptized with, the Spirit,—that Spirit which is promised of the Father,—until he has been baptized with water?* And is it not alike self-evident that the law of the gospel is uniform?† Again; is it not also evident that every individual who believes the word, and is baptized according to the word, shall, in acccordance with the passages before-mentioned, receive the gift of the Holy Ghost? And does it not therefore follow, that such an individual, and such an one only, is born of water and of the Spirit? As in nature there must be a conception and beginning of life in a proper child, before the birth; and a birth when the child issues from the darkness of the womb, and is brought into the light of day: so in grace, the believer, the begotten of God "with the word of truth,"‡ in whom is the beginning of spiritual life, is in issuing from the water, which is a striking representation of the womb, brought to the birth,§ and thus figuratively delivered from the darkness of death, and brought into the "light of life."‖ Again; as a child, before it is born, is not accounted a member of an earthly family, so, according to the scriptures, no unbaptized person is accounted a member of the heavenly family, the family of God.¶ Even the Great Head of the Church was not called the Son of God, until he had been born of Mary;** neither was he manifested as such until he had been baptized.†† Cornelius gave demonstrable evidence of being born of the Spirit, previous to his baptism; but even he who was as one born before the due time, could not be privileged to eat with the apostles at the Lord's table until he had been baptized in water.‡‡ From this circumstance, which is in accordance with the Evangelist Mark (xvi. 16), is it not manifest that faith without baptism is of no avail?

Again; this Witness says, "'The answer of a good conscience,' spoken of by Peter, cannot be given by him who is not regenerated." True; but, gentlemen, how can this answer be given previously to his fulfilling the last, and consequently one of the most important, of the Testator's commands? See Mark xvi. 15, 16. It is by fulfilling this command that the believer manifests his love to his Master;§§ to him who says, "Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I com-

* See Acts ii. 38.

† See Matt. iii. 16; Acts i. 5; ii. 1—4; viii. 17; xi. 16, 17, and xix. 5, 6.

‡ James i. 18. § Isa. lxvi. 9. ‖ John viii. 12; Col. ii. 12, 13.

¶ Acts ii. 47. ** Luke i. 35. †† Matt. iii. 16, 17.

‡‡ Acts xi. 3. 15—18. §§ John xiv. 21.

mand you."* David also says, "Then shall I not be ashamed when I have respect to all thy commandments."† From which we may safely infer, that while an important command remains unfulfilled, there can be no good conscience. And this, gentlemen, I can by experience attest!

The Testator said to Nicodemus, "He that doeth truth cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God."‡ Can a believer, then, in the first instance, come to the light, and make manifest the good work which the Lord has wrought in him, in any other manner than by boldly confessing with the mouth, in open day, and sealing his confession by being baptized in water? It is this which distinguishes him from the unbeliever, who, like Nicodemus, comes in the night; but comes to some pretending "master in Israel," and vainly imagines that by so coming his evil deeds will go unreproved.§

The Sixth Witness said, "The only wonder is that any man of common sense should ever have maintained the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. But, gentlemen, I maintain that it is not so great a wonder as that any reflecting man should maintain the practice of infant sprinkling, a practice as much opposed to common sense, as it is to the gospel. It is the doctrine involved in this practice which is the parent of that which he decries, and which is responsible not only for that abuse, but for every other, of which it is the originator. This being true, then does not the doctrine of infant sprinkling warrant all the scorn with which he complains it has been assailed. He decries baptismal regeneration, as a doctrine of the Church of Rome, which harmonizes well with the innumerable absurdities of that antichristian community; "which doctrine," says he, "is contained in the articles of the Church of England, constituting one of the remnants of popery." But, gentlemen, what doctrine does his creed contain? Why, a chief part of that to which the remnant belongs. This he decries, but that he defends.

Again; he says, "That infant baptism contains a practical testimony from the Divine Author of the institution to the necessity of regeneration, is a very different thing from its being regeneration itself, or *invariably* accompanied by it. What inference can we draw from this language, but that he supposes it may *sometimes* be accompanied by it? He has not attempted to prove that the Most High was the divine Author of the institution, as he ought to have

* John xv. 14. † Ps. cxix. 6. ‡ John iii. 21. § John iii. 20.

done. No! he is well aware that he cannot succeed in this. My learned friend has indeed admitted that "the practice of baptizing by immersing the person under water, thereby burying him, as it were, in the water, and raising him out of it, was anciently the more usual method;" yet he has qualified his admission by stating "that the instances of baptism which we have brought before us in the New Testsment are chiefly those of grown-up persons come to full age; we say chiefly, because...there are *intimations at least* of the baptism of younger members of a household." Now, gentlemen, seeing that all infants are alike unconscious of change, how can this Witness, while admitting that some may be regenerated, blame those who assert that baptism and regeneration are one and the same thing? He may rest assured that as all infants who die come into and go out of the world alike, so they shall at death be alike happy. The statements and acts of this Witness declare that there is, in some way or other, a peculiar privilege attached to christened infants whose parents he denominates believers; though he is unable to define what that privilege is. But the gospel informs us that the redeemed are not "born of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."* How then can difference of birth make a difference in the happiness of those who die in infancy, when the child of the christian and the child of the infidel come into and go out of the world alike innocent?

The remark on baptismal regeneration comes with a very bad grace from this Witness, who himself christens infants. For what is this christening of infants but a doctrine of Rome, the chief corner-stone of the building of error? Mark, gentlemen, its commencement, its progress, and its completion. A few days after the infant is born, it is christened, when the priest says, "We receive this child into the congregation of Christ's flock," &c. Then, after it is able to speak distinctly, it is taught to say, "In my baptism I was made a member of Christ," &c. Next, as soon as it can *say* the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, it is brought to be confirmed, and *made* to say, "I do here, in the presence of God and of this congregation, renew the solemn promise and vow that was made in my baptism, ratifying and confirming the same in my own person, and acknowledge myself bound to believe and do all those things which my godfathers and godmothers then undertook for me." Last of all, the man dies, when the priest says,

* John i. 13.

"Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God to take unto himself the soul of our *dear brother*... we therefore commit his body to the ground, in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life," &c. And lo, gentlemen, the head-stone of the building! the whole being a mere mechanical operation, with neither life nor spirit in it!

Oh, but this Witness will exclaim, "I repudiate these absurdities, on principles of reason"! Be it so, gentlemen; still, he is wonderfully tenacious of the rite which begets them. His manner of building may, in outward appearance, have more of solidity, and viewed at a distance it may be somewhat fairer to behold; but it is only the more deceptive. Being erected upon the same sandy foundation as the other, when the rain descends, and the floods come, the fall of it will be the same. "All error, gentlemen, is transitory; and though numerous errors have exercised an empire over men, yet they have perpetually changed their form; one error has chased another, has held a temporary sway, to be possessed by its successor; but truth, eternal truth, is enduring and unchangeable."

Now what shall we say, gentlemen, of the Seventh Witness? He is either halting between two opinions, or he is wanting in courage boldly to declare himself. First, he asserts that "without baptism none can enjoy the salvation of God," and endeavours to prove his position by comparing baptism with circumcision. Secondly, he turns round, and informs us that he means not to assert that baptism is indispensably necessary to salvation; in which case it can have no correspondence with circumcision, which was required without exception of every Jewish male, on pain of excision. Mark, also, his irreverent manner of expression; "There is," says he, "a meaning not to be *despised*, in the following passages, John iii. 5, and Mark xvi. 16." This is a sort of inconclusive evidence, which neither advances what the plaintiffs maintain, nor opposes what their opponents defend.

And with respect to the Eighth Witness, the small particle IF is here the only support of his creed. Deprive him of that, and where is he? It is by this that he strives to prove that infants are capable of being born again, and therefore ought to be allowed the washing of regeneration. Thus (seeing infants are incapable of faith,) he makes baptism and regeneration one and the same thing. And if this does not constitute one of the remnants of Popery, which his brother, the Sixth Witness, denounces as appertaining to the Establishment, I am at a loss to know what is.

Observe, gentlemen, where the error of this Witness lies. He regards the term little children, as used by our Lord, as implying children in years; which, according to Matt. xviii. 2—6, is evidently not the case. And in the words of our Lord which apply to adults, as in John iii. 5, for "man," he substitutes "*any one*," thus wresting the text in such a manner to include infants. And why does he this, but in order to show that unchristened infants must be lost; which unscriptural sentiment, according to him, "strongly concludes for the baptism of infants."

Let not the Independents, after this, boast any more of charity. It is true, they qualify their "hard saying," by asserting that there is a place between earth and heaven in which unchristened infants undergo a probation, after which there is a prospect of their being saved. Gentlemen, can there be held in the church of Rome a more gross and unscriptural doctrine?

But, gentlemen, in what part of the Will do we read of a two-fold regeneration, or, in other words, of two births? Can a man be born a second time in Zion, any more than he can "enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born"? Or can Christ have two bodies?* Does not Christ himself say, "My undefiled is but one?"† Is not the gift of the Holy Spirit promised and imparted to him that is baptized in faith?‡ And does not this one baptism, with its promised accompaniment, seal him at once and for ever a member of the body of Christ? Yes, gentlemen, it at once inducts him into "the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels. To the general assembly of the church of the first-born which are written in heaven; and to God the judge of all; and to the spirits of just men made perfect. And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel."§ Thus, "God who is rich in mercy," even now, while we are here upon the earth, makes us "sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus."‖ This is the commencement of our enjoyment, which will continue to increase while we remain on earth; and after we go hence, to our "Father's house" above, we shall still sit together with an increase of joy that must be experienced before it can be expressed. Nor can there be any other way of entering that church, which "Christ

* Col. i. 18—22. † Cant. vi. 9. ‡ Acts ii. 38.
§ Heb. xii. 22—24. ‖ Eph. ii. 6.

loved, and gave himself for it,"* than by the way he himself has ordained, which is, believing and being baptized.

The Ninth Witness argues as if he was not aware that the people of God, as a body, under the old dispensation, were only a type of the "peculiar people," the saints, under the new. And as he gives no proof of circumcision being the sign of those things which he attributes to baptism, there is no necessity for me to notice them. Neither does he give us any proof that children who die in infancy are actually regenerated. Consequently, as there is no visible sign of what he calls "the seed of life" germinating in the *spared*, we may safely conclude that in christening it was never sown, either in those that die, or in those that survive.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON MATT. XXVIII. 19; ON MARK XVI. 16; AND ON ACTS II. 41.

(The first two passages being the two clauses which occasioned the present Trial; and the last, that which gives the first account of the Apostles fulfilling the commission of their divine Master.)

"GO YE THEREFORE, AND TEACH ALL NATIONS, BAPTIZING THEM IN THE NAME OF THE FATHER, AND OF THE SON, AND OF THE HOLY GHOST."—"HE THAT BELIEVETH, AND IS BAPTIZED, SHALL BE SAVED, BUT HE THAT BELIEVETH NOT SHALL BE DAMNED."—"THEN THEY THAT GLADLY RECEIVED HIS WORD WERE BAPTIZED, AND THE SAME DAY THERE WERE ADDED UNTO THEM ABOUT THREE THOUSAND SOULS."

The FIRST WITNESS, after quoting Matt. xxviii. 19, said, "Because I (Christ) have the authority ... and can send *whomsoever* I will, to do *whatsoever* I please, 'Go teach,' make disciples of all nations, bring them to an acquaintance with God who bought them, and then 'baptize them in the name of the Father.'†...

"He that credits this gospel as a revelation from God, *and is*

* Eph. v. 25—27. † Matt. xxviii. 19.

baptized, takes upon him *the profession* of it, obliging himself to walk *according* to its *precepts:* he shall be saved, redeemed from sin here, and brought at last to the enjoyment of eternal glory. 'But he that believeth not shall be damned,' because he rejects the *only* provision that could be effectual to his soul's salvation."*...

Baptism "was the criterion of a Jew's conversion, and when a Jew had received baptism in 'the name of Jesus,' he was then excluded from all communication with his countrymen; and no man would have forfeited such privileges but on the fullest and clearest conviction....The three thousand were not converted under *one discourse*, nor in *one place*, nor by *one person*. All the apostles preached, some in one language, and some in another; and not in *one house;* for where was there one at that time that could hold such a multitude of people?...The truth seems to be this. All the apostles preached in different parts of the city, during the course of that day; and in that day 'three thousand converts were the fruits of the conjoint exertions of these holy men.'†

The Second Witness remarked, "It is not said, he that is not baptized shall be *damned;* because it is not the want, but the contempt of baptism that damns, otherwise infants might be damned for their parents' neglect.‡...We need not inquire whether the apostles did it by dipping or sprinkling, both being lawful; but this may be said, it is hard to guess how such a quantity of water could be brought to the place as might serve for the decent dipping of three thousand persons in so short a time. And upon the supposition that the water was not brought to them, but they went down to that, baptizing so many by dipping would have required a week, rather than a day, to despatch it in."§

The Fourth Witness said, "There are two words in this passage (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20,) which are translated *teach* and *teaching*, but they are of a different meaning. The former means that general instruction which was necessary to bring men to profess themselves the disciples of Christ, and the other relates to their more particular subsequent instruction in all the various parts of christianity. As the words might have stood in the same order if it had been a command to go and convert all the nations to Judaism, circumcising them in the name of the God of Israel, and teaching them to

* Mark xvi. 16. † Acts ii. 41. ‡ Page 167. § Page 373.

observe the law of Moses, no argument hence can be fairly adduced respecting the *subjects* of baptism. For in this case it would have been understood that the adult males must be circumcised on a profession of the Jewish religion, and their infant offspring at the time appointed; and in like manner all adults admitted into the church from among the Jews and Gentiles must be instructed into christianity before they were baptized, though their infant offspring might be baptized also; and the case is exactly the same still."*...

Peter "exhorted the Jews to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, as professing their faith in the Messiah; yet there is no reason to doubt that they were baptized 'in or into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' according to the appointed form. As so great a number were baptized on this occasion, and as they were not by the river Jordan, 'where was much water,' or near to any other river, but in the midst of a populous city, crowded also with strangers, it is at least highly probable that they were not baptized by immersion."†

The Fifth Witness said, "The proof on which this institution (baptism) rests, as a perpetual ordinance of Christ in his church, is so entire and so obvious, that every doubt concerning it is more properly an object of surprise than of serious opposition.... Christ commands his apostles and all his succeeding ministers to baptize those whom they should make disciples. In obedience to this command, the apostles accordingly baptized all those who were made disciples by *them*. Those who followed them in the ministry, followed them also in this practice. In this manner the institution has been continued in the church, with the exception of a few dissentients, to the present time.‡...'He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned'...may be justly construed in the literal manner, for he who persists in this act of rebellion against the authority of Christ will never belong to his kingdom.§...

"The apostles are directed to make disciples of all nations, and then to baptize them. That they understood their commission in this manner is unanswerably evident, from their own declarations; 'Repent, therefore,' said St. Peter to the Jews, 'and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus.' When the eunuch said to Philip, 'See, here is water, what does hinder me to be bap-

* Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. † Acts ii. 41. ‡ Page 514. § Vol. 2, pages 515, 516.

tized? Philip replied, 'If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.' Lydia was baptized after 'the Lord had opened her heart.' The jailer was baptized in consequence of his faith. So was Paul. So was Cornelius and his household. From these facts and declarations, it is evident beyond controversy that adults were baptized by the apostles after they had become, or were supposed to have become, disciples of Christ; or, in other words, after they were either really or apparently regenerated."*...

"It is impossible that those whom Peter and his companions baptized on the day of Pentecost should have been immersed. All the difficulties which attended the baptism of *John's* followers, attended that of these people also, and probably in a still higher degree; because they did not assemble to be baptized, nor even to hear the preaching of the apostles. They therefore certainly assembled in their own usual dress. At the same time, it seems almost a thing of course that the apostles, who had just received a spiritual baptism by the affusion of the Holy Ghost, and announced it to their hearers, should follow the mode in which this baptism was administered to them, in administering the baptism which was symbolical of it to their hearers.

"But independently of these considerations, the thing itself could not be done by the apostles, in the circumstances and within the time specified in the mode of immersion. St. Luke informs us, that they who received the word of Peter were then baptized, and that the same day 'there were added to them about three thousand souls.' The only way in which these persons could be known to be added to the church, or could in fact be added to the church, was by their baptism. They were therefore baptized that day. But the apostles could not, in any supposable circumstancses furnished by the city of Jerusalem, nor indeed in any circumstances whatever, baptize by immersion three thousand persons within the utmost part of that day which the story will allow us to consider as left for this purposes, after the other transactions mentioned in it were ended. The least consideration of the time necessary for each administration will clearly show its impossibility. I conclude, therefore, without hesitation, that these persons were not immersed."†

The Sixth Witness said, "I am aware, indeed, how frequently and how confidently it has been alleged that the words of the

* Vol. 2, page 516.

† Vol. 2, pages 544, 545.

institution, as they have been improperly called, (I say improperly, because baptism was not at that time first instituted, but had been practised before,) involved a repeal, by declaring that none are to be *baptized* but such as are capable of being *taught*. The well-known words are, 'Go ye therefore,' &c.

"The reply to this is simple and satisfactory, although I am sufficiently aware how strongly a certain habit of mind in viewing a particular passage tends to prevent the clear perception of the validity of any reasoning directed against the sense thus habitually and systematically affixed to it. Suppose the ordinance of *circumcision* had been to continue, and the command had run in these terms, 'Go ye therefore and disciple all nations, circumcising them,' &c. Had such language been used, we should have known that children were to be the subjects of the prescribed rite as well as their parents, the previously existing practice would have ascertained this. Nor should we have been sensible, even with this knowledge, of the smallest impropriety or inconsistency in the use of this language. Would it have appeared to us, in even the slightest degree, contradictory or incongruous? Would it have been understood by the apostles as necessarily excluding children? Would they certainly have inferred from it that although the same rite was to continue, there was to be a change in the subjects of it? That none now were to be circumcised but those who were capable of immediate instruction in the will of Christ, and practical compliance with it? No, there is nothing in the terms of the commission that could at all have led them to such a conclusion. They would without hesitation have gone on to circumcise children with their parents as formerly, teaching the parents the mind and will of Christ, and charging them to instruct their rising offspring. And if a commission to *circumcise*, given in these terms, would not have been understood as necessarily excluding children, it can never be shown that a commission in the same terms to *baptize* must have been so understood."*

The Seventh Witness said, "When I read the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, I receive no conviction that Peter sent away so much as one individual, drenched and dripping to his own house. Some mocked when they heard the disciples speaking with tongues, saying, 'These men are filled with new wine.' What would

* Page 51.

they have said had they beheld the scene closing with the immersion of three thousand people in water? How laborious the operation of its performance! How terrible the discomfiture which must have ensued upon retiring among the recent unprepared and agitated disciples! Here, again, the scarcity of water makes the idea of immersion incredible. All the pools in Jerusalem united would have been quite inadequate.*...

"From this text (Mark xvi. 16,) some infer that a person must actually believe, else he cannot be baptized. With as much reason they might infer that a person must actually believe, else he cannot be saved; especially as it is added, 'He that believeth not, shall be condemned.' But it is acknowledged that infants shall not be condemned because they do not believe. No objection can therefore be brought from this text against the baptism of infants."†

The EIGHTH WITNESS said, an "argument for admitting infants to baptism may be drawn from the sense in which the apostles, when sent forth to baptize, would naturally and even necessarily understand their commission. 'GO TEACH (disciple or proselyte) ALL NATIONS, BAPTIZING THEM.' It is now enquired in what sense they would understand this commission? Whether as authorizing them to baptize only the believing adult, or to give this token of God's covenant also to the infants of such believers? The commission is delivered in such general terms as not certainly to determine this. If any part of it can be said to exclude infants, it must be the word *teach*. But suppose it had been said, Go *teach*, proselyte *all nations*, CIRCUMCISING *them;* would not the apostles, without any further warrant, have naturally and justly thought, that upon proselyting the Gentile parent, and circumcising him, his infants were also to be circumcised? Or, if a dying command had been given to the twelve patriarchs of old to go into Egypt, Arabia, &c., and teach them the God of Abraham, circumcising them; would they not, must they not, have understood it as authorising them to perform this ceremony, not upon the parent only, but also upon the infants of such as believed in the God of Abraham? Without all question they would.

"Hence, then, it is plain that the word *teach* (disciple or proselyte,) concludes nothing certainly against infants being admitted, with their believing parents, into God's covenant by baptism. But

* Page 161. † Page 208.

if the word *teach* does not necessarily exclude infants, let us see whether there are not such circumstances attending this commission as would naturally and even necessarily lead the apostles to apprehend infants to be actually included therein.

"Now here let it be considered who the persons were to whom the commission was given. They were Jews, men who had been educated in the knowledge of that covenant which God had made with Abraham and their fathers, and who knew it still to be in force. Men who had seen that in all covenant transactions betwixt God and his church, the infants of believers had always been admitted, together with their parents, and passed the same initiating rite....

"The commission, viewed in this, which is its proper and true light, is so far from concluding anything against the baptizing infants, that it strongly favours and supports it. For since it is delivered in such general terms as to be capable of admitting infants, and since from the above circumstances the apostles would naturally and unavoidably understand it as intending their admission, it follows, that our Lord's silence as to these, is a strong and most manifest presumption in their favour; and that his not excluding or excepting them from the christian covenant, is, in all equitable construction, a permission or order that they should be admitted to it."*

The Tenth Witness, after making some remarks on the words Βαπτιζω and εις, said, "Let us then try a passage or two, and that these may be as unexceptionable as possible, I shall select only some of the defendants' favourite texts. We shall begin with the baptismal statute, as they call it, which is the very corner-stone of the building. Now what does it say according to their most natural signification and natural ideas? 'Go ye therefore and teach all nations, *dipping* them *into* the name of the Father,' &c. Here I would ask, Did they ever try their own translation of Βαπτιζω and εις? They are both here, and they bring certain strange things to our ears, for they say the apostles were to dip people into a name.... How do they perform this experiment, for to me it appears impracticable. A sand baptism is nothing to this! With their sentiments, I could not for my neck know how to baptize by dipping into a name, it is such an uncommon element. Surely much learning doth make them mad. '*Dipping* them *into* a name!' And yet, if their *sense* is not to be suspected, this was the ordinary way the

* Pages 25—28.

apostles did; for according to their translation of the Greek text, we are told of some (Acts viii. 16,) who had not received the Holy Ghost, only they were dipped into the *name* of the Lord Jesus; and again we read of others (Acts xix. 5,) who were *dipped into the name* of the Lord Jesus; and Paul says, (1 Cor. i. 14, 15,) I thank God that I dipped none of you but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I had *dipped into my own name.* A name, therefore, seems to have been the ordinary element in which people were dipped in baptism, according to their meaning of Βαπτιζω and εις; but how the experiment was performed, and this natural idea was reduced to practice, is above my capacity."*

The Counsel for the Defendants, addressing the jury, said,—

Gentlemen, the evidence you have just heard is so inconclusive as to be almost unworthy of notice; in fact it is such as would not be received in any earthly cause, even the most trivial. It never appears to have occurred to these Witnesses that guessing is not evidence, that probability is not evidence; nor are conclusions however strong, nor convictions however honest, nor presumptions however plausible. Weak as is their case, however, it is nevertheless requisite for me to trespass on your attention while I reply to them.

And here allow me to ask, gentlemen, why it is that none of these Witnesses have attempted to prove that infants were included in the three thousand; or, if not, that some of their children were baptized with them? On this important point every one them of is silent. And why are they silent? Doubtless because, from the manner of Peter's teaching, they are convinced to the contrary, and their consciences therefore prompt them to silence. And although they would fain persuade you that the three thousand were not baptized by immersion, not one of them had the courage to assert that they were sprinkled.

It was on the self-same day, the day of Pentecost, that memorable day, on which the apostles were inspired by the Spirit of God, that, in furtherance of the commission just before given them by their heavenly Master, they taught their fellow-men for the first time, and for ever, who were, and are, the only subjects of baptism; that the

* Pages 35, 36.

gift of the Holy Ghost is consequent on genuine baptism in water; and that baptism in water was and is the only way of entrance into the Church of Christ. (See Acts ii. 38—47.) Strange then, that man should still delude himself by imagining there are many ways of entrance, or suffer himself to be so deluded by others! Or that he should scripturally expect to be "enrolled" among the general assembly of the first-born in heaven,—who according to the gospel has never been "enrolled" among the saints on earth. Yet so it is.

It is evident beyond controversy, said the Fifth Witness, that the apostles converted the people before they baptized them, and that by so doing it is unanswerably evident that they understood their commission. So far he is right. And so far he excludes children. But mark his prevarication. It is impossible, says he, that those the apostles baptized should have been immersed. Is it not strange, gentlemen, that neither the President of a college, nor any other of the Witnesses usually denominated learned, should be able to express themselves in English? What is the meaning of the baptized being immersed, but the immersed being immersed? And why were the three thousand not baptized? Because all the difficulties,—mark, gentlemen, *all* the difficulties,—which attended the baptism of John's followers, attended that of these people also; and probably in a still higher degree. What that higher degree was, he has not informed you; but he had previously said that John's followers would have been exposed to certain disease or death, had they been baptized with their clothes on; and could the followers of the apostles well be exposed to more? The apostles, gentlemen, did not know in what manner "they were baptized with the Holy Ghost."* How then could they take that baptism for the pattern of another?

However, I shall do this Witness the justice to say, that in contradiction to what he said on the clause immediately preceding those clauses we are now upon, he told you, without reserve, that the text, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," may be fairly construed in the literal manner, *i. e.*, he who rejects the ordinance of Christ, will never belong to his kingdom. This is also the opinion of the First Witness, who well explains the concluding clause of Mark xvi. 16, "He that believeth not shall be damned," when he says, "*because* he rejects the only provision that could be effectual to his soul's salvation." He further

* See John iii. 8.

admits that an acquaintance with God who bought them, must precede baptism.

The Fifth Witness also truly observed that the only way these persons could have been added to the church was by their baptism. It follows therefore that a person can no more be reckoned a subject of the kingdom of heaven, previous to his baptism, than a foreigner can be reckoned a subject of the United Kingdom previous to his naturalization.

To the Tenth Witness, gentlemen, it is not requisite that I should reply. He either does not understand, or pretends not to understand, the commission, and therefore turns it into ridicule. This is no uncommon thing with those who attempt to argue upon a subject on which they are ignorant. "But ridicule, sneers, and contempt are not argument;" and are not usually resorted to by men of understanding. You are aware that the preaching of Christ crucified was "unto the Jews a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness."*

You will not have forgotten, gentlemen, that the Fourth Witness styled himself an honest witness: but he has given you no proof of it. When once a person enters that box, predetermined not to tell the whole truth, he cannot avoid committing himself. Thus when this Witness says the people were not by the river Jordan, where there was much water, he tacitly admits that John, when he was there, did baptize in it; for he gives as a reason, because at the day of Pentecost the apostles were not there, but in a populous city, so that it is *at least highly probable* that they did not baptize on that day by immersion. It is but too manifest, gentlemen, that he has the fear of man before his eyes, and dare not speak out; for, on a former examination, he admitted that the multitudes were baptized *in* or *at* Jordan.

I shall here, gentlemen, read you another short extract from one of the pamphlets lying before me, in which the Sixth Witness, speaking of the Testator, whom he ventures to call his gracious Master, thus proceeds: "'To this end,' said the Testator, 'was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.' And in bearing this witness there was no compromise, no trimming, no accommodation of his doctrine to the pride and worldly-mindedness of his hearers, so as in the slightest iota to alter or modify its principles, in order to conciliate its oppo-

* 1 Cor. i. 23.

nents, and preserve peace."* I appeal to you, gentlemen, if this Witness, while standing in the box, gave any proof of being a worthy servant of so exalted a Master. Like the Fourth and Eighth Witnesses, he would have you believe that if in the commission "circumcise" had been put instead of "baptize," the apostles would have gone on circumcising children with their parents. This, gentlemen, will not bear examination. Let us suppose *a case*, viz., that an earthly monarch deputed a number of learned men to go through his dominions with a view to instruct his people, and that he gave them authority to make all whom they instructed Doctors of Divinity. They go forth, but, strange to say, they so read their commission that they confer the degree not on those whom they instruct merely, but on all their offspring also, whether young or old, male or female, or both. I presume that these Witnesses would themselves condemn such a proceeding as absurd. And yet it would be neither more contradictory nor incongruous than their own act; for instead of instructing the man, and bringing him into the church, they presume him to be already instructed, and therefore bring in his child!

Could any person of common understanding, much less the twelve in whom was the Spirit of God, and who were educated under the law, have inferred that infants, in this case, would not have been excluded; for otherwise they must have understood that they were commanded to teach infants, even if "circumcise" had been substituted for "baptize." Does the Witness mean us to understand that baptism was twice instituted, or that the Testator adopted a previously instituted rite?

Another short extract, gentlemen, and I have done. It is from another publication by this Witness, bearing upon the clause before us, and is as follows:—"Nothing can well be clearer, than that 'all nations,' in the one passage,† is of the same meaning with 'all the world,' in the other.‡ And it no more follows from the one that they were to baptize *nations* collectively, than from the other that they were to baptize the *world* collectively. On the contrary, we have the distributive sense of both expressions decidedly fixed by the Saviour himself. While he gives the universal commission, he limits the baptism to the *individuals who should believe;* just as he limits the salvation. No such thing is contemplated by Him who

* Lecture on Voluntary Church Controversy, in Liverpool, page 23.

† Matt. xxviii. 19. ‡ Mark xvi. 15.

gives the commission, as either the baptism of nations, or the baptism of all mankind. The commission is universal—the anticipated results personal. The preaching is to all, for the purpose of 'making disciples;' those disciples were to consist of the individuals of all nations who should believe: and to them,—that is, to such as made a credible profession of the faith,—the baptism was to be restricted. ...Error is never self-consistent."* How far the last clause of this extract applies to his own statements, it is for you to judge. But he would do well to reconcile his contradictory statements with the following parenthetic declaration, made on what "Christ's words actually express," in regard of the question put to him by Pilate:—"With what other sins soever I may have to charge myself, I cannot plead guilty to having ever, in the course of my ministry, for the sake of supporting any article of faith or practice, affixed a meaning to any one text or portion of the word of God different from what, in my conscience, I have believed to be its true and proper import; the 'mind of the Spirit.'"†

The conviction of the Seventh Witness, being without foundation, neither militates against our cause nor advances his own. It would have been strange indeed, if the water which was amply sufficient for the supply of a populous city, together with all the adult males in Judea, would not have sufficed to baptize three thousand individuals. What though it is acknowledged, by all who have received the truth, that those who die in infancy shall not come under condemnation because they do not believe, are there any of these Witnesses who dare, in a straightforward, positive, open, and manly manner, avow that all infants who die without their helping hand will be eternally happy? Would either this Witness or the Sixth avow it? They may incidentally avow it, but has any one of them the courage to act upon the avowal? No, gentlemen; on the contrary, they will not, after their own manner, assist in the salvation of a poor innocent, unless it has been born of what in their vanity they call believing parents. If the christening of one infant does not imply that it is in a salvable state, and the refusing to christen the other the contrary, then of what service is the rite? But the Will, gentlemen, makes no such distinction. Infants come under no further condemnation than temporal death, from which they will

* Letters to the Rev. Hugh McNeile, M.A., on some portions of his "Lectures on the Church of England," No. 6, pages 28, 29.

† National Church Establishments Examined, fifth thousand, page 28.

be redeemed by the resurrection of Christ. No matter what their parents may be; whether believers, nominal Christians, Jews, Mahometans, pagans, or savages, all, while incapable of committing sin, are in the sight of God upon a level. "Where no law is, there is no transgression."*

Then, with respect to the Eighth Witness, would it not be well if his constituents would study Psalm l. 16, 17; as they, through him, impugn the wisdom of the Testator, both because he did not clearly define the proper subjects of baptism, and because he did not define those who are not; as if those who do not come within the terms of the commission were not by consequence excluded. This Witness appears to have taken a leaf out of my learned friend's brief; for he concludes that what is not forbidden is permitted, a conclusion which, as I have before shewn, justifies the christening both of "horses and asses." If any part of the commission, says he, excludes infants, it must be the word TEACH. Yes, gentlemen, that word most certainly excludes them — that mighty word, which all the sophistry of all the pedobaptists in the world cannot in the slightest degree impugn or invalidate. It presents a barrier to their unhallowed footsteps which they can never surmount. Strange, indeed, it is, that while the Witnesses can inform you how the apostles understood the commission, not one among them understands it himself; or, if he does understand it, he speaks and acts as if he did not. And is it not more strange, that while this Witness, without doubt or hesitation, can undertake to say how the twelve patriarchs would have understood it, yet he himself acts and argues as if he knew no more about it than the child he christens!

It was remarked by the Second Witness, that it is not said, he that is not baptized shall be damned; because it is not the want, but the contempt of baptism that damns; otherwise infants might be damned for their parents' neglect. The natural inference from these remarks then is, that to christen them is a work of supererogation, and the rite useless; for it is clear they cannot contemn an ordinance of which they know nothing. The obvious reason why it it is not so said is this: if the word had been repeated in the condemnatory clause, it would have left it doubtful whether faith was required at all, or only baptism. Besides, the non-repetition of the word shows, that the absence of faith precludes baptism, the latter being consequent on the former; therefore, let our opponents strive

* Romans iv. 15.

as they please, they cannot twist the text so as to favour their own cause.

If the condemnatory part of the clause were at variance with the saving part, would it not, as I have before said, neutralize the latter, and render it void? How then can it be made to imply that belief without baptism is available? The ordinance was positively commanded by the Testator,* and illustrated at the day of Pentecost by the first preaching of the apostles, after that "the kingdom of heaven" had been established on earth. And it is indisputable, therefore, that there can be no other way of entering into his kingdom—no other way of being incorporated into him—than that of his own appointment.†

The words of the promise are as perspicuous as words can be:—"He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved:" and the incontrovertible import of it is, that an individual must believe before he can be scripturally baptized. If it had been written, He that believeth not, and is not baptized, the meaning would have been equivocal; for, until he does believe, he is not fitted to make the required profession, and by consequence naturally remains unbaptized, and therefore under condemnation. These Witnesses would doubtless have gladly taken advantage of the repetition, and said, that if even faith were required, every one might be baptized, as that would be complying in part with the requisition, whether they had faith or not. This would have furnished a better pretext for christening infants than any which the Witnesses have brought forward, because they might very well say, Children are capable, in the simple sense of the word, of being baptized, though they are not capable of believing. This would appear far more specious than receiving their profession by proxy, or even admitting that if they die without sin they shall be saved, and are therefore fit subjects of baptism.

This Witness also remarked, that "had the three thousand been baptized by dipping, it would have required a week rather than a day to despatch it." How long it would have required to despatch it, had the administration been conducted according to his own practice, *i. e.*, as it is commanded by the rubric of the church of England, I shall leave you to judge, after I have read to you a condensed form of the "service," as it stands in the Prayer Book. In

* Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

† Mark xvi. 15, 16. Acts. ii. 37—41. Rom. x. 9. I John iv. 2, 3.

that book we read of three different administrations of what is there called baptism; but that named the "administration for such as are of riper years," is the most suitable to our purpose, as the silence of all the Witnesses on this point is a tacit admission that the three thousand were adults. It runs as follows:—"When the sponsors shall be ready to present the converts at the font, the priest shall ask whether any of the persons here presented be baptized or no. If they shall answer, No; then shall the priest address them....Then shall the priest say, Let us pray, and here all the congregation shall kneel. Then...after the prayers, the people shall stand up, and the priest shall say, Hear the words of the Gospel written by St. John, in the third chapter, beginning at the third verse. After which he shall say this (long) exhortation following: Beloved, &c....After that, a short prayer. Then the priest speaks to the person to be baptized on this wise, Well beloved, &c., ye must also for your part promise in the presence of these your witnesses, &c....Then shall the priest demand of each of the persons to be baptized, severally, these questions following: Dost thou renounce the Devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of this world, with all the covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, &c. Dost thou believe, &c. Wilt thou be baptized in this faith? Wilt thou then obediently keep, &c. Then shall the priest say two prayers, the one containing four requests, the other beseeching that the water may be sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin. Then shall the priest take each person to be baptized by the right hand, and placing him conveniently by the font, according to his discretion, shall ask the sponsors the name, and then shall dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying, I baptize thee, &c. Then shall the priest say: Seeing that these persons are regenerate, &c. Then shall be said the Lord's Prayer, all kneeling; then another prayer. Then, all standing up, the priest shall use this exhortation, speaking to the sponsors first: Forasmuch as these persons have promised, in your presence, to renounce the devil and all his works, you must remember that it is your part and duty to put them in mind what a solemn vow, &c., they have now made before this congregation, and especially before you, their chosen witnesses, &c. And then, speaking to the new baptized persons, he shall proceed to say: And as for you, who have now by baptism put on, &c."

Gentlemen, let the great length of this service, with all the interruptions that would have been likely to occur, from the confusion

of seeking nine thousand sponsors, and the delay occasioned in collecting such a number,—many of the Jews might have refused to stand, as I am told many Episcopalians now do, and that many of them have even qualms of conscience in respect of christening at all,—I say, let these things be considered, and contrast with them the simple administration as appointed by the Testator, and it will clearly appear on which side the difficulty preponderates.

But I am willing to allow that the ceremony might have been greatly accelerated, if the apostles had acted after the manner which some of you, as well as myself, have occasionally, no doubt, witnessed, in churches situated in densely populated parishes, where, to save time and trouble, one service is made to answer for scores of infants; where the questions are not put *severally*, but collectively; and where the only teaching is at the font; for on the questions being put by the priest, he says to the sponsors, the answer is so and so. But, gentlemen, these are vulgar christenings; nevertheless, they are no more at variance with the commission of the Testator than are the christenings of the infant princes and of their royal sisters.

Every unprejudiced person must acknowledge, that in a city like Jerusalem, which was then so plentifully supplied with water, there must have been a sufficiency not only to baptize three thousand persons, but to baptize the whole of the inhabitants, together with the numerous strangers that were on that day assembled there; and that the plea (insufficiency of water) set up by the Plaintiff's Witnesses is too puerile, nay, too worthless, to deserve notice.

The pattern of baptism, as ordained by the Testator, is once for all clearly shown in the example of the eunuch, who was baptized almost as quickly as Philip spoke the words, "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest." So on the day of pentecost, the apostles, aided by the brethren,—of whom there must have been a great number present, seeing that a little while previously our Lord had been seen by above five hundred at once,—might, as their preaching was accompanied with such extraordinary power, both with ease to themselves and in due order, and also with all solemnity, have baptized the three thousand, after the pattern of the eunuch, in a few hours.

Gentlemen, I trust these remarks will have satisfactorily removed all the difficulty attending this particular circumstance, alike from your minds and also from the minds of our opponents; for, as men possessing reasoning faculties, they can but perceive that the diffi-

culties originate with themselves, from a partial and prejudiced view of the case, arising from the influence of early prepossessions. And this, I trust, they will at length acknowledge, and yield a strict obedience to the commands and teachings of the Testator, as the only "way of salvation."

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON ACTS VIII. 36—39.

"And as they went on their way, they came to a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest: and he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch: and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing."

The First Witness said, "This is no proof that the Scriptures cannot be understood without an authorised interpreter, as some of the papistical writers assert. How could the eunuch know anything of the gospel dispensation, to which the scriptures referred? That dispensation had not yet been proclaimed to him. He knew nothing about Jesus. But where that dispensation has been published — where the four gospels and the apostolic epistles are at hand—every thing relative to the salvation of the soul may be clearly apprehended by any simple, upright person....All that relates to *faith* and *practice*—all in which the present and eternal interest of the soul is concerned—'the wayfaring man, though a fool,' quite illiterate, 'shall not err therein.'*

* Acts viii. 31. 38.

"While Philip was instructing" the eunuch, "and he professed his faith in Christ, he probably plunged himself under the water; as this was the plan which appears to have been generally followed among the Jews in their baptisms; but the person who had received his confession of faith was he to whom the baptism was attributed, as it was administered by his authority."

The SECOND WITNESS said, "The eunuch is instructed before baptized, and he desired baptism... it was not forced upon him by Philip against his will....It is conviction, not compulsion, that must induce assent. The eunuch, after instruction, desired baptism,... the qualification of that faith which gives a right to the holy sacrament,—'If thou believest with all thine heart'—only that faith gives a right to baptism, and entitles to salvation, which is with all the heart. The manner of administration...he went down into the water, and was baptized by Philip; in those hot countries it was usual to do so." *

The FOURTH WITNESS said, "The discourse of Philip...fully convinced the eunuch, through the concurrent teaching and illustration of the Holy Spirit, that Jesus was the promised Messiah, and he was enabled to understand the nature of his kingdom and salvation; accordingly he desired to be numbered among his disciples. Doubtless Philip had showed him the nature of baptism as the initiatory ordinance of christianity; when therefore they came to the water, he desired to be baptized...and stedfastly professing faith in Jesus as the 'Messiah, the Son of God,' he was baptized by Philip. Men will form their conjectures concerning the mode in which Philip baptized him, according to their different sentiments on that subject."†

This, said the FIFTH WITNESS, is "another passage often triumphantly alleged" by our opponents. "To the translation here, no reasonable objection can be made. I will therefore not avail myself of what might however be justly alleged, to wit, that εἰς may with equal propriety signify *to*, and ἐκ *from*. Still I object to the construction of my antagonists for these reasons:—

"1. That we as naturally say, that they went into the water, of those who went in to the depths of the knees, or even of the ancles, as of those who have plunged themselves.

* Page 395. † Acts viii. 36—40.

"2. The declarations here made, are made concerning the eunuch and Philip alike; of both it is said that 'they went down into the water,' if we render the word εις *into*; of both, also, it is said that 'when they were come up out of the water,' if we render the word εκ *out of*. Now let us see what will be the true import of the passage according to this mode of construing the words in question. And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; that is, they were both plunged, and he baptized him, *i. e.*, Philip plunged the eunuch. And when they were come up out of the water, that is, when they had both been plunged the second time, and risen up from their immersion, 'the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip.' In other words, both were plunged twice, and the eunuch the third time....

"3. I conclude, as I think with certainty, that these words have no reference to the immersion of either, but are barely descriptive of the fact that they went down *to* or *into* the water, in which perhaps they waded a little distance."*...

The SIXTH WITNESS remarked, "Nothing can be clearer than this. *The act of baptizing* is something quite distinct from either the *going down into the water*, or the *coming up out of it*. If these two phrases had any reference at all to the mode of baptism, it would follow that Philip was immersed under the water, and emerged out of it, as well as the eunuch; which no one supposes. The plain meaning is, that Philip and the eunuch descended together from the chariot, *to*, or if you will, *into* the water; that when they had so descended, Philip baptized the eunuch, but *in what way* not a hint is given; and that, this being done, they ascended together again *out of*, or *from* the water."†

The SEVENTH WITNESS said, "Notwithstanding our translators say, Matt. iii. 16, 'Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway OUT OF the water,' I suppose that no man upon the earth, who can read ἀνεβη εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος, imagines it to be any thing else than 'he went up straightway FROM the water.' Now it surely will not be said that Philip had any occasion to go further with the Ethiopian nobleman than John did with our Saviour, in order to the administration of baptism. It is reasonable then to understand the εις and the ἐκ of Acts viii. 38, 39, as signifying precisely what is

* Vol. 2, page 546, 547. † Page 175.

indicated by the ἀπὸ of Matt. iii. 16. I am far from saying that εἰς does not often signify *into*, and ἐκ *out of:* but I say they do not possess those meanings necessarily, or universally, and particularly, for the reason given above, they do not possess them in Acts viii. 38, 39.*...

"Let it be supposed that the baptizer led the person to be baptized, not only to the water, but into it, the question returns, what did he do with him there? I answer, that all the language of scripture which relates to the *act* of baptizing, informs us that he took a handful of the water and POURED IT OUT on his turned-up face."†

The EIGHTH WITNESS said, "Nor will the circumstance of Philip and the eunuch going down (εἰς) *unto the water, and coming up* (ἐκ) *from it*, with any certainty prove that he there dipt him. For as waters run in the valleys, they might go down from the chariot (εἰς) *to* or *unto* the rivulet, (for geographers find but little streams there,) and Philip baptize, by pouring water on him; and from thence go up to the chariot again, in the most perfect consistence with this account of the matter."‡

The NINTH WITNESS said, "The great passage of the immersionists ... is Acts viii. 38, 39. This is relied upon as a decisive proof of the *immersion* and *emersion* of the eunuch. If so, however, it proves too much, for nothing is said of the eunuch which is not said of Philip. 'They went down BOTH *into* the water: and when THEY were come up *out of* the water.' And so Philip must have immersed himself as well as the eunuch. Nor will the prepositions determine the case; they would have been employed properly had Philip and the eunuch gone *into* the water by partial or by entire immersion, and therefore come *out of* it on dry land; and with equal propriety, and according to the habitual use of the same prepositions by Greek writers, they would express going *to* the water, without going into it, and returning *from it*, and not *out of* it: for εἰς is spoken of place, and properly signifies *at*, or it indicates motion towards a certain *limit*, and, for anything that appears to the contrary in the history of the eunuch's baptism, that *limit* may just as well be placed at the nearest verge of the water as in the middle of it"§

The TENTH WITNESS said, "There is a passage which speaks

* Page 92. † Page 75. ‡ Page 106. § Page 438.

about going down to the water, and coming up from the water, and there is only one, so far as I know, in which these prepositions are both used. This is Acts viii. 38, 39.... What water this was we cannot tell, only it was in the way from Jerusalem to Gaza, and might either be a spring or a rivulet, for I scarcely think there was any river in that desert. But be this as it may, you have seen that the prepositions εἰς and ἐκ, in the New Testament, ought frequently to be rendered simply *to* and *from*, and therefore we have no more proof from this passage that Philip and the eunuch were in the water, and came out of the water, than we have that our Lord was in the mountain,* or that the Queen of the South came out of the heart of the earth.† But supposing that Philip and the eunuch went both of them literally *into* the water, and came literally up *out of* the water, what does this prove? That they were in to the ancles, or the knees perhaps, and that is all.

"Now there the eunuch might be sprinkled as easily as at the side, for there would not be so far to stoop for the water, and as the people then wore sandals for shoes, and a sort of petticoat for small-clothes, the eunuch, although he had been in the water, would neither have been obliged to strip nor to submit to any inconveniences, on the supposition that he was sprinkled. But if he was wholly immersed in the water, he must either have stripped naked, or changed his clothes, or made a wet chariot, though we should speak of no other consequences; and that he did any of these the silence of the passage and the circumstances of the case make very improbable.

"Nay, that εἰς here cannot signify over the head, the passage makes abundantly plain, for it tells us repeatedly they went down *both* into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and therefore both were equally deep. But I suppose they (the ministers of the defendants,) do not usually go under water themselves every time they dip an individual, and yet they must do so before εἰς in this solitary passage will be of any service to their cause. Some folks would almost suspect that the Spirit of God had foreseen what use they would make of this passage, when it is so particularly said, They went down *both*, &c."‡

* Matt. v. 1. † Matt. xii. 42. ‡ Pages 32—34.

To the foregoing evidence, the reply of the Counsel for the Defendants was as follows:—

Gentlemen—Well may the poet say, "A little learning is a dangerous thing." These Witnesses "darken counsel by words without knowledge;" proof sufficient of the poverty of their cause. I am exceedingly rejoiced that nine of them have ventured to speak on this all-important passage; I expected that they would have been too wary to grapple with it. But they have grappled with it, and in such a manner as to bewilder the Court. For it is impossible, from what they have said, for any one to come to a solid conclusion on it. In order to show their contradictory and inconclusive evidence in the most striking manner, I shall contrast it, in fewer words.

The First Witness said, That the eunuch probably plunged himself;

The Second, That he went down into the water, and was baptized by Philip;

The Fourth, left every one to follow his own conjectures.

The Fifth, concludes that the clause has no reference to baptism.

The Sixth said, That not a hint is given of the way the eunuch was baptized.

The Seventh, That Philip poured a handful of water on the eunuch's turned-up face.

The Eighth, That going down into, and coming up from the water, does not prove that Philip dipped him.

The Ninth, If the clause be taken as a proof of immersion, it proves too much.

The Tenth, The eunuch might have been sprinkled as easily in the water, as at the side of it.

Gentlemen, does not this confusion of tongues remind you of the builders of Babel, when they could no longer "understand one another's speech"? And ought not the illiterate to be very thankful to the First Witness, who gives them the information that the scriptures can be understood without an authorised interpreter? For what could they learn, either from the Plaintiff's Counsel or their Witnesses, who, our opponents even will allow, are a fair average of the authorised Protestant teachers of Great Britain.

The apostles, whom our Lord chose to convert the world, were mostly illiterate men, taken out of the lowest grades of society; and

this description of men he still chooses to forward his purposes. "Carey, Ward, and Marshman, one a shoemaker, one a printer, and the other a school-master, have done more towards spreading the knowledge of the scriptures among the heathen, by translating them into different languages, than has been accomplished or attempted by all the world beside."*

The unlearned are the men who most generally study the scriptures for themselves; they are assured that their teachers are not in a corner, but that their eyes see them;† and of their own knowledge they are convinced that "the gospel of Christ is the power of God to salvation."‡ This gospel is their great teacher; it speaks nothing but truth, and that in the plainest language. Yet the educated classes regard it as an abstruse revelation; so much so, that it is said of the late Bishop Webb, that his wish and prayer was to be saved from the simplicity of Bible religion. In consequence they have recourse for instruction to what they term the Fathers—to men of ancient times; and to those also of the present day who have attained popularity through fortuitous circumstances; or have acquired pre-eminence in collegiate or academic learning and worldly wisdom. To the latter they listen, as to one "that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument."§ But when the blind lead the blind, gentlemen, we are well aware what the consequence must be.‖

As a further proof of the poverty of the Plaintiffs' cause, and of the irrelevancy and incoherency of the arguments, if arguments they may be called, which have been used in support of it, I shall read you a few extracts from the book I hold in my hand.

"The eunuch was travelling on the public highway, when Philip met him. They had been reading and commenting on a prophecy of the Messiah, in which mention is made of his *sprinkling many nations.* When they came to a rivulet of water, the eunuch said,—'See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?' Philip had no doubt been explaining to him the nature and design and obligation of this ordinance, or he would not have been likely to ask such a question. The servant of God consented to baptize him; and as they were travelling, and probably destitute of any convenient vessel for dipping up a portion of water from the stream, they both went down to the water, probably no further than its margin, far

* Quarterly Review. † See Isa. xxx. 20.
‡ Rom. i. 16. § Ezek. xxxiii. 32. ‖ Matt. xv. 14.

enough to take up a small portion of it, to sprinkle or pour on the eunuch." And again: "As a poor man, (speaking of John,) who lived in the wilderness, whose raiment was of the meanest kind, and whose food was such alone as the desert afforded, it is not to be supposed that he possessed appropriate vessels for administering baptism to multitudes, by pouring or sprinkling. He therefore seems to have made use of the neighbouring stream of water for this purpose, descending its banks, and setting his feet on its margin, so as to admit of his using a handful, to answer the symbolical purpose intended by the application of water in baptism." *

Bear with me, gentlemen, while for the same purpose I read one or two extracts from another publication,* the author of which stands high in the estimation of three of the Witnesses, and is, I believe, an acknowledged leader of their sect. "Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water.... So we read it, but not right: for it is...*from the water;* from the brink of the river, to which he went down, to be washed with water: that is, to have his head or face washed; John xiii. 2 [qu. 9;] for there is no mention of the putting off or putting on of his clothes, which circumstance would not have been omitted, if he had been baptized naked."— "The eunuch ordered his coachman to stop....They went down both into the water,—for they had no convenient vessel with them, being upon a journey, wherewith to take up water, and must therefore go down into it. Not that they stript off their clothes, and went naked into the water, but going barefoot, according to the custom, they went perhaps up to the ancles, or midleg, into the water; and Philip sprinkled water upon him, according to the prophecy which the eunuch had probably just now read." ‡ May we not therefore with justice exclaim, "This their way is their folly; yet their posterity approve their sayings"?§

Gentlemen, this clause demands our most serious attention, for it points out, in the clearest possible manner, the proper subjects for baptism, and the precise order in which the ordinance ought to be administered. All the circumstances are detailed in so exact and in so regular a manner, as to furnish us with a perfect pattern, a pattern to which all believers must of necessity, and will with delight conform, as it is requisite to the enjoyment of the promised blessing.

* Infant Baptism Scriptural and Reasonable, pages 77, 79.
† Matthew Henry's Commentary, Matt. iii. 16, 17, and Acts viii. 38.
‡ Isaiah lii. 15. § Psalm xlix. 13.

We regard it, indeed, as an example so complete in all its parts, that none can mistake it, save those who wilfully close their eyes against the truth, and "reject the counsel of God." And such are the Plaintiff's Witnesses, who strive to obscure its perspicuity by having recourse to a species of reasoning derogatory to the honour of the Holy Spirit, and degrading to themselves as men professing to be faithful.

From this charge, however, I must except the Second Witness. He allows to the passage its true, simple, and clear reading, and thus admits that the immersion of a believer was, in the times of the apostles, the only way of introduction into the Church of Christ. That it was so is undeniable; and hence it follows, that as the ordinance has never been repealed, it must continue so till time shall end. Notwithstanding the observation of this Witness, that it is conviction, not compulsion, that induces consent, and that it is faith only which gives a right to baptism, and entitles to salvation; yet in the face of his own declaration, he christens and awards salvation to those who are not only incapable of conviction, but of faith also!

It is painful to think, gentlemen, that in what the First Witness has said regarding the baptism of the eunuch, how little indication there is of that purity of motive, that simplicity of intention, by which he professed, at the commencement of his examination, to be guided? Has he not wrested the scripture from its obvious meaning, and does not the fact itself controvert his assumption? Where was the utility of Philip accompanying the eunuch into the water, if it was not to baptize him; for he had already heard his confession in the chariot? We have, indeed, the admission, that baptizing and plunging are synonymous terms; but why should this Witness suppose that the Evangelist took no part in the transaction? This cannot help his cause; for even if it had been the practice of the early christians to plunge themselves, which we deny, that practice must still exclude infants; there is no exception made in their favour, and they cannot follow the example.

The Fourth is the Witness who told us he trusted his efforts to explain the Holy Scriptures have "been conducted from proper motives, and in dependence on the Lord;" and who confidently appeals to his heart-searching Judge, that, "as far as he knows, he has not kept back the sense of any passage"! What then, we may ask, can his motive be for leaving his evidence on this important

point so inconclusive? What but that which he has previously denied? "the fear of incurring reproach or opposition; the desire of conciliating the favour of men; or to serve a personal or party interest." You cannot believe it possible, gentlemen, that he himself had formed no opinion as to whether Philip baptized or rhantized the eunuch; and he ought, as an acknowledged expounder of the Will, and as an upright Witness, to have stated honestly what that opinion was.

Gentlemen, does not the withholding of his conjectures prove to you that if he had followed his own conviction, he would boldly have declared that Philip baptized him; for if he had declared that he sprinkled him, he would neither have incurred reproach nor opposition; on the contrary, he would have conciliated the favour of men. When he, in his Commentary, attempts to elucidate Titus iii. 5, he says, "The expression 'shed' or '*poured* on us' in this manifest allusion to the sacrament of baptism, may properly be noted as an intimation that the pouring of water (but 'shed' is the word used,) on any person 'in the name of,' &c. is *baptism* equally with immersion." Now suppose for argument's sake that it is, (though the text forbids the supposition,) could he have had a better opportunity than the present to have stated his own conjectures whether Philip, when he went down into the water with the eunuch, baptized, or poured water upon him? Why then did he keep them back, and thus "shun to declare" the whole sense of the passage? Was it not conscience which restrained him from declaring that he affused him? And did he not compromise with his conscience for not boldly declaring that he baptized him? Will he say that this was "involuntary, the effect of ignorance and error, and not of design"?

The disquisition of the Fifth Witness may be very learned, but to ordinary minds it is inexplicable. How both of them going down into the water, and both coming up out of the water, can imply that Philip was baptized twice, and the eunuch three times, is difficult to discover. I regard this part of his evidence as nothing less than a jest on holy things, and a punning upon words, which borders upon blasphemy. If his remarks on this text be a specimen of the new opinions he has adopted, he has not improved upon the old ones, however unscriptural they might have been, and which he told you he had been obliged to abandon. He concludes that they both went down to, or into the water; does he conclude that they went down inadvertently, without a purpose? If he does not, he ought to have

declared his views as to what their purpose was, and the manner by which they effected it.

The Sixth Witness observed, "The act of baptism is something quite distinct from either going down into, or coming up out of, the water." Surely, gentlemen, you required no modern sciolist to give you this information. He also observed that "Philip baptized the eunuch, but in what way not a hint is given." True, gentlemen, not a hint that favours his views, and therefore he declares that no decision can be drawn from it. Yet he told you that "he intended to show, from the plain statements of the New Testament itself, that baptism was performed by sprinkling or pouring." Surely he cannot require a fairer opportunity to prove, as well as to assert, how "*baptism was in this instance performed.*" He acknowledges that Philip baptized the eunuch; and the word baptize must have some definite meaning; now this meaning he is, by his professed intention, bound to declare. He has told you that pedobaptists, himself one, do not deny that the verbs Βαπτω and Βαπτιζω signify to dip or immerse, but they do deny that this is their only signification. And so do we, gentlemen; but we also assert that when there is in the Will an allusion to water, they always signify to immerse. If profane writers use them with this signification, it would indeed be strange if they lost this signification when used by sacred writers. I think, gentlemen, there is some indication here of this Witness going "aside from the divine record," which he has given the world to understand he could not do "without impiety and presumption."*

The Seventh Witness spoke much after the manner of the Fifth, except that he affirmed on the one hand, what he denied on the other. No believer in Christ can resist the evidence contained in this clause as relating to baptism, when viewed in connexion with other parts of the Will. And the candid mind, that searches it with a sincere desire for salvation, must acknowledge that the text is amply sufficient, without any comment, to exhibit the nature and import of the administration. It was not needful, gentlemen, for either Philip or the eunuch to go down into, or even *to* the water, merely to obtain a little of it to pour on the uplifted face of the other.

If the inspired evangelists, had intended to show that the water was to be poured or sprinkled, they would doubtless have stated it plainly, in appropriate words, with which their language so richly abounds, they would not have particularised the circum-

* See his Lecture in Liverpool on Voluntary Church Controversy, page 5.

stances of descending from the chariot, going down into, and coming up out of the water, the natural tendency of which would be to lead to a widely different conclusion. Nay, these Witnesses would have been the first to scoff at the idea of two individuals taking such unnecessary trouble to accomplish that which, according to their account, might have been accomplished with much more facility in the eunuch's carriage. "See, here is water!" the eunuch exclaimed; "what doth hinder me to be baptized?" This joyful exclamation of the eunuch would hardly have escaped him if a few drops would have sufficed; or if he had not been previously instructed by Philip into the nature and design of baptism—the true character of the Saviour—and the nature of the kingdom which he came to establish, the first step into which must be made by a public profession of faith in that ordinance, as essential to his salvation. It is worthy of remark, that it was not until after the eunuch had uttered the joyful exclamation, "See, here is water!" &c., that Philip pointed out to him, in a more definite manner, that none but a believer could be scripturally baptized: "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." And this address brought out his confession, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;" by which he testified that he had received the blessing of faith; while the mysterious removal of the evangelist, who was caught away by the Spirit of the Lord, when they were come up out of the water, would be to the eunuch a proof, not less convincing than miraculous, that Philip had been sent to him by that Spirit. Well might he then go "on his way rejoicing," the Spirit bearing witness with his spirit that he was a child of God, that he had been adopted into his family,* and that the declaration of the Testator, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved," had been fulfilled in him, as in all others who had made a similar confession.

Nor must it be overlooked, that it was previous to the people knowing "the way of salvation," that they said unto Peter, on the day of Pentecost, "What shall we do?" and that he replied, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." So also with Paul, when he said, "What shall I do, Lord?" "Arise, and go into Damascus," was the reply, "and there it shall be told thee." And there Ananias said to him, "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his

* Gal. iv. 5.

will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth....And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."* So it was likewise with the jailor, when he said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" the answer was, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Then Paul and Silas "spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house.... and he was baptized, he and all his, straightway."†

Thus was it shown, in the days of the apostles, that repentance and faith, to be available, must be succeeded by baptism, as instituted by Him of whom Paul said to the baptized Corinthians, "*All* things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation."‡ And we are warranted to conclude that the same rule is binding still; seeing that "Jesus Christ," who enjoined the ordinance, is "the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever."§ How important, then, that all who feel their lost state as sinners, should take especial heed to "work while it is day," calling on the Lord to open their hearts, that they may be enabled spiritually to confess his well-beloved Son, while their mental and bodily health will admit of it; yet taking especial care that they do not unadvisedly rush into the ordinance, "as the horse rusheth into the battle."‖ For if they do, they will, like Simon the sorcerer, remain "in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity."¶

From the evidence of the Seventh Witness we turn to that of the Eighth. He said, that "going down into the water, and coming up from it, does not prove that Philip dipt the eunuch." Mark, gentlemen, the pusillanimous manner of this Witness—this ackowledged representative of his sect—this Witness, expressly deputed by eleven of his brethren, and these eleven the most popular of their party,—numbering among them five with the title, D.D., one LL.B., M.D., one LL.D., and one A.M.,—he had not the courage to assert that Philip sprinkled the eunuch, after his and their practice, nor yet that he did *not* baptize him; but very modestly said, Philip *might* have poured water upon him, when *at* or *in* the rivulet. Here, then, gentlemen, we have a specimen of what this Witness and his constituents denominate "manly and conclusive reasonings." But how does he know that it was not a *lake*, or a *river*, rather than

* Acts xxii. 10. 16. † Acts xvi. 30—33. ‡ 2 Cor. v. 18.
§ Heb. xiii. 8. ‖ Jer. viii. 6. ¶ See Acts viii. 11—23.

a rivulet? Because, foresooth, geographers find little water there. Where is there a geographer that knows the place? And even if it were known, the probability is, that there is no water there. Moses prophesied, upwards of three thousand years ago, that "the stranger that shall come from a far land shall say, ... that the whole land thereof is brimstone, and salt, and burning; that it is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth thereon."* And the reason of the land being so cursed is, "they (the Israelites) have forsaken the covenant of the Lord God of their fathers."†

The Ninth Witness asserted, that nothing is said of the eunuch which is not said of Philip. Why, gentlemen, is not this a direct untruth? Will he assert that the pronouns *he* and *him* relate to both individuals, as both baptizing, and both being baptized? or that the conversation in the chariot does not clearly indicate which was the baptizer and which the baptized?

The evidence, gentlemen, of the Tenth Witness, is too puerile and incoherent to merit a reply; yet my duty will not permit me to pass it over. He has taunted my clients with being ignorant of Greek; but however ignorant they may be of that language, almost the youngest child in their society would smile at his silly remarks, "that the eunuch might have been sprinkled as easily in the water as at the edge of it; because Philip would not have so far to stoop to dip his finger into it." And that on account of the eunuch wearing a *petticoat*, he might, by tucking it up, go down into the water without any fear of making himself uncomfortable, by either wetting it or his chariot. But mark his words, gentlemen: "SUBMIT TO INCONVENIENCY." To what inconveniency did Paul put himself for the defence of the truth;‡ yet this Witness would not have had the eunuch put to the inconvenience of taking off his clothes, or even wetting his chariot, in order to be inducted into the church of Christ, through which church only lies the way to eternal glory;§ a way of which, it is to be feared, this Witness is ignorant; for had he known it, he would doubtless have spoken of the inducting ordinance with more reverence.

The clause before us, gentlemen, so clearly furnishes an example of the administration of baptism, that none of the Witnesses dare gainsay it. The evidence you have heard, tends to show how widely men will wander, after they have once made up their minds to

* Deut. xxix. 22, 23. 25.
† See also Psalm cvii. 33, 34.
‡ 2 Cor. xi. 23—28.
§ See Acts ii. 47.

deviate from the true path. The plain, straightforward, good old road, they hate; and, consequently, every step they take leads them further from the "mark," and illustrates what is said in Jeremiah xiv. 10.

In this instance, gentlemen, the word "baptized" is univocal, otherwise it would not have been used by the Testator to specify his ordinance. And from the eunuch's baptism being given in such detail, and in a manner so distinct, so simple, and so clear, it must be regarded as a pattern for all future time. There can be no excuse, therefore, for the Plaintiffs pretending not to understand it as to the 'mode' even, much less for not understanding it as it respects the 'subject.' And as there is no instance recorded in the Will of any individual being baptized, who was not either a genuine or professed believer in Christ, so therefore, either to dip, or sprinkle, or pour water on any other, as an observance of the rite of baptism, is to offend against the Holy Spirit, He who dictated the Will. It would, indeed, be incongruous to suppose, that the Lord would reveal to sinners the way of salvation, and yet not state that way in a manner so definite as to be easily understood by those who seek it with their whole heart.

This clause, then, is of the utmost importance, as it hands down to us a perfect pattern of the administration of baptism, as commanded by the Testator; a pattern from which we can no more deviate, and yet be held guiltless, than could Moses deviate from the pattern shown him in the mount; and which the Almighty impressed upon his mind, when he said, "Look that thou make all things after the pattern."* It is impossible that we can worship God in an acceptable manner, or believe in the promise of the Testator, unless we understand what baptism is; who are the subjects, and what is the purport, of it; "casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."† To the rebellious, the disobedient, and the thoughtless, the Lord says, "Hear, O earth; behold, I will bring evil upon this people, even the fruit of their thoughts; because they have not hearkened to my words, nor to my law, but rejected it. To what purpose cometh there to me incense from Sheba, and the sweet cane from a far country? Your burnt offerings are not acceptable, nor your sacrifices sweet to me. Therefore, thus saith the Lord, Behold,

* Exod. xxv. 40 † 2 Cor. x. 5. See also Matt. xv. 8, 9. and John viii. 43.

I will lay stumbling-blocks before this people, and the fathers and the sons together shall fall upon them; the neighbour and his friend shall perish."* Seeing, then, "that these things are so," what claim can our opponents prefer, until they become obedient, and are better instructed; until they have "their understanding enlightened," to behold the ordinance in its true light; and, so beholding it, be prepared to confess the Lord in the way of his appointment? "If the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?"†

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON THE BAPTISM OF CORNELIUS AND HIS FRIENDS,

(As related in the 10th chapter of Acts, particularly the 47th and 48th verses.)

"CAN ANY MAN FORBID WATER THAT THESE SHOULD NOT BE BAPTIZED, WHICH HAVE RECEIVED THE HOLY GHOST AS WELL AS WE? AND HE COMMANDED THEM TO BE BAPTIZED, IN THE NAME OF THE LORD."

Concerning the individuals referred to in this passage, the FIRST WITNESS said, "These had evidently received the Holy Ghost, and consequently were become members of the mystical body of Christ; and yet St. Peter requires that they shall receive baptism by water, that they might become members of the christian church. In other cases they received baptism first, and the Spirit afterwards, by the imposition of hands. See Acts xix. 4. 6, where the disciples who had received only the baptism of John, were baptized again with water, in the name of the Lord Jesus; and after even this, the apostles *prayed* and *laid their hands on them*, before they were made partakers of the Holy Ghost. So we find that Jesus Christ had his *water baptism*, as well as John; that even he who gave the baptism

* Jer. vi. 19—21. † 1 Pet. iv. 18.

of the *Holy Ghost*, required the administration of *water baptism* also. ...Therefore the baptism of the Spirit did not supersede the baptism by water, neither indeed can it....To be baptized in the name of the Lord,... implied the taking upon them the public profession of christianity, and believing on Christ Jesus, as the Saviour and Sovereign."*

The SECOND WITNESS said; "What a miraculous power of the Holy Ghost did accompany St. Peter's ministry at this time, thereby giving him an assurance of the future conversion of the Gentiles.... Accordingly, while Peter was thus preaching to Cornelius and his friends, the Holy Ghost, by his wonderful gift of tongues, descended on them. The conclusion which the apostle draws from this is, they ought to be baptized with water....They have the inward part, or thing signified, why then should the outward sign be denied them? He that hath the inheritance may claim the writings, the seals, &c., belonging to the inheritance. The apostles without scruple baptized these Gentile converts."†

The THIRD WITNESS, quoting Bishop Beveridge, said, "The apostle, considering that this gift of the Holy Ghost was only to make them to speak with tongues, not to regenerate them, inferred from thence that they ought the rather to be baptized."‡

The FOURTH WITNESS said, "Peter justly concluded that it would be unreasonable to refuse them the baptism of water; and when none of his companions could say anything against it, he ordered them to be baptized by some of those who attended him. These words contain a plain and convincing demonstration of the falsehood of the Quakers' doctrine, that water baptism is unnecessary, to them who have received the inward baptism of the Spirit; since the apostle here not only declares that water baptism ought therefore to be administered to these persons, because they had already been baptized with the Holy Ghost, but also commands them to be baptized on that account.§...Cornelius must himself be saved, not by his prayers and alms, his piety and equity and charity, but by the words which Peter would speak to him, and by faith in those words; and thus also salvation would come to his family."‖

* Acts x. 47, 48. † Page 404. ‡ Page 34.
§ Acts x. 44—48. ‖ Acts xi. 4—17.

The SIXTH WITNESS said, "As Peter began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on all them who heard the word; and they of the circumcision were astonished,...because that on the Gentiles also was *poured out* the gift of the Holy Ghost." Let the court then look at "Peter's words; the Holy Spirit was *poured out;* and Peter called to mind the promise, which of course he considered as being then fulfilled, 'Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit.' According to Peter, then, baptism was effected by *pouring out*: till better authority be produced, I desire to bow to this." *

The SEVENTH WITNESS said, "When I read the words of Peter, 'Can any man forbid water?' &c....I believe he proposed that water should be brought in, for affusion, to the room or place where the company were assembled; not that they should be carried for immersion to a bath, a pool, or a river." †

The Counsel for the Defendants now stood up, and said,

Gentlemen, nothing can be clearer, as the First Witness asserted, than that "the baptism of the Spirit did not supersede the baptism of water." The instance before us is the only one recorded in the Will,—if we except that of Paul, of whom, as I have before said, we cannot speak so particularly,—of any individuals receiving the baptism of the Spirit previous to their being baptized in water. The reason is manifest. Cornelius and his friends were the first Gentile converts under the new dispensation, and something extraordinary was required to convince Peter and his followers, the Jews, that the middle wall of partition was indeed broken down; that the distinction between Jew and Gentile had for ever ceased; and that the converts of the latter were as much entitled to enter the church as those of the former. So also in the instance of Paul, it was to convince Ananias and the world that the power of the Lord was able even to remove the stony heart from him who styled himself the the chief of sinners, from the man who had persecuted the saints "unto the death." Here then is undeniable proof that the command of the Testator respecting baptism is in *every* case of con-

* Page 167. † Page 170.

version peremptory and indispensable. Peter knew that until Cornelius and his friends were baptized, he could neither acknowledge them as brethren, nor eat with them at the Lord's table. This same Witness told you the purport of baptism, which, by his own shewing, was never designed for infants; whilst he also made it clear that the verb baptize applies, in this instance, to two widely different subjects.

But what authority, gentlemen, has this Witness for declaring that Cornelius and his friends had, previously to their being baptized in water, become members of what he calls, but without having any authority to call, the "mystical body of Christ"? Is not his church and his body one and the same thing?* How then could they have become members of his church, previous to their being by baptism inducted into it? Or how shall it be possible for the Testator to present to himself, as a part of his glorious church,† those who had never, in the way of his own appointment, been made members of it?

Now, gentlemen, I hesitate not to remark, that wherever, after the proclamation of the Testator's commission, believing is, in the following part of the Will, singly mentioned, as the procuring cause of the remission of sins, baptism is also implied. This I think is irrefragably proved by the 43d verse of the chapter we are upon; "To him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." These words were from the lips of the same Peter who, on the day of Pentecost, said, "Repent, and be baptized, *every one of you, for the remission of sins;* and were uttered immediately before he commanded Cornelius to be baptized. Therefore Peter preached only one way of remission of sins—only one way of salvation. Soon after the day of Pentecost, indeed, he proved this, by saying, in the presence of the rulers, and elders, and scribes, and Annas the high priest, and his kindred, "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved;"‡ a manifest declaration that no man can be saved, except in the way of God's appointment.

"Every believer, therefore, who, according to the original institution, as preached by John,§ comes to this 'baptism of repentance for the remission of sins,' is truly convinced of his sinful state, and con-

* See Col. i. 18. 24. † Ephes. v. 27. ‡ Acts iv. 12.
§ Mark i. 4, 5.

fesses that he is 'wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked;'* that his whole life has been a course of sin, and alienation from God; and that, so long as he remained without Christ, whatever he thought to be his best works, were done on a carnal principle, and, being enmity against God, were regarded by him as unholy. And he now comes to the great Redeemer for deliverance from the whole body of his sinfulness, depending alone on the virtue of the blood of the Lamb for remission of his sins. He declares his sincere repentance from dead works, and that he now yields himself unto God, to be refined from all his pollutions, through the special grace that is in Christ Jesus the Lord, and by the powerful influence of the Spirit of Holiness, in the effectual application of the gospel of the grace of God. He now yields himself to the teachings of the word of Christ, looking for the guidance of the Spirit of truth, to direct him how to walk to the glory of God the remaining part of his life; his soul's desire is to keep the commandments of the Lord; and he is found waiting for wisdom and power from Christ, the fountain of life, that he may live to the glory of the Father, until it shall please God to call him out of the body."

I am not aware that there is any difference between the baptism of John and the baptism of the Testator, as commanded in his commission, except this; John baptized saying unto the people that "they should believe on him which should come after him;'† the apostles baptized in the name of him who had already come. Our Lord said, John *truly* baptized with water. Both were alike the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.‡ Paul baptized those mentioned in Acts xix. 1—5, because that which they had regarded as baptism was a nullity, for they were utterly ignorant of the nature of the ordinance; while it is said, Luke i. 76, speaking of John, "And thou, child, shalt be called the prophet of the Highest, for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways." Surely, then, our Lord would not deviate from the ways that his heavenly Father had appointed.

The Second Witness said, "He that hath the inheritance, may claim the writings;" But he ought rather to have said, He that hath the writings may claim the inheritance. Peter had satisfactory proof that Cornelius and his friends were apparent heirs; but he knew by his commission that they could not enter upon the possession pre-

* Rev. iii. 17. See also Deut. xxvi. 5—10.
† See Acts xix. 4. ‡ Matt. iii. 11; Acts ii. 38.

vious to their writings being made complete, and that they could not be completed until they themselves had complied with the Testator's requirement. When they testified their compliance, by being baptized in water, then the writings were duly sealed and signed, and, by an irreversible title, the inheritance was their own.

The Third Witness would obviously be wiser than the Spirit of God. The gift of tongues had hitherto been a standing proof of regeneration; and this gift being imparted to Cornelius and his companions, Peter was convinced that their hearts had been opened of God, who had thus prepared them to confess his well-beloved Son in the ordinance of baptism. By this ordinance they were inducted into the kingdom of heaven, and became members of his glorious church. But this is a hateful doctrine, as well to this Witness as to the bishop. It saps the foundation of their church, which is laid upon baptismal regeneration.

The Fourth Witness, by arraigning the Quakers, because they do not see the importance of water baptism, arraigns himself. He would have us believe that he himself has a great regard for it; but he is not less faulty than they. Pretending to see the importance of it, he yet not only vitiates it, but denounces all as unfeeling and presumptuous who insist on its unqualified observance. If those who had given positive and undeniable proof of having been baptized by the Spirit,—the greatest gift that can be communicated to man,—were nevertheless commanded afterwards to be baptized in water, are we not authorised to assert that this example proves beyond doubt that in every instance of conversion baptism is imperative? This Witness informed you that Cornelius was saved only through believing; but he seems to insinuate that the friends of Cornelius were saved not through their own faith, but through his. How averse is prejudice to acknowledge the truth!

Gentlemen, the disingenuousness of the Sixth Witness calls for especial remark. See how he wrests the scriptures, by endeavouring to make it appear that the administration of baptism with water was after the manner of that with the Spirit—things as different from each other as baptism and christening. The baptism of the Spirit, however referred to, is an invisible operation;* the speaking with tongues was the proof that that operation had taken place. An inward, mysterious influence upon the mind, then, can never be an example for an outward ordinance upon the body; and if this Wit-

* John iii. 8.

ness can bow to such an incongruous idea, we must not be surprised if others refuse to follow his example. But he feels that the ground on which he stands is opening beneath his feet, and therefore he, like a drowning man, catches at straws.

The *belief* of the Seventh Witness, honestly as he may cherish it, is inadmissible; we must, therefore, commit what he has said to the winds.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON THE BAPTISM OF THE JAILOR AND HIS HOUSE,

(As related Acts xvi. 30—34.)

"SIRS, (said the Jailor,) WHAT MUST I DO TO BE SAVED? AND THEY SAID, BELIEVE ON THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, AND THOU SHALT BE SAVED, AND THY HOUSE; AND THEY SPAKE UNTO HIM THE WORD OF THE LORD, AND TO ALL THAT WERE IN THE HOUSE; AND HE TOOK THEM THE SAME HOUR OF THE NIGHT, AND WASHED THEIR STRIPES, AND WAS BAPTIZED, HE AND ALL HIS STRAIGHTWAY; AND WHEN HE HAD BROUGHT THEM INTO HIS HOUSE, HE SET MEAT BEFORE THEM, AND REJOICED, BELIEVING IN GOD WITH ALL HIS HOUSE."

"Thus, (said the FIRST WITNESS,) by teaching him and all that were in his house the doctrine of the Lord, they plainly pointed out to them the way of salvation. And it appears that he and his whole family, who were capable of receiving instructions, embraced this doctrine, and showed the sincerity of their faith by immediately receiving baptism; and, by the way, if he and all his were baptized straightway ... immediately, instantly, at that very time ... it is by no means likely that there was any immersion in the case; indeed, all the circumstances of the case—the dead of the night, the general agitation, the necessity of despatch, and the words of the text all disprove it. The apostle, therefore, had another method of administering baptism besides *immersion*, which, if practised according to the Jewish formalities, must have required considerable time, and not a little publicity."

The SECOND WITNESS said that "the jailer believing, he and his whole house were baptized. The apostle denied not baptism to the jailer's household, upon the jailer's sincere profession of the christian faith. Yet no doubt he promised to use his utmost endeavours to bring them to the knowledge and obedience of Jesus Christ....How improbable is it that the jailer and his house were baptized by dipping! We do not deny the lawfulness of baptizing by immersion, but we cannot assert the absolute and indispensable necessity of it. St. Paul, who was newly washed, and his sores dressed, occasioned by stripes, cannot be supposed either to go out himself, or to carry the jailer and all his family, in the dead of the night, to a river or a pond to baptize them; neither is it the least probable that St. Paul himself was baptized by dipping;*...the context may convince us that he was baptized in his lodgings, being sick and weak, having fasted three days, and being in a very low condition....It was no ways probable that Ananias should carry him out to a river in that condition, to plunge him in cold water. Dipping, then, surely cannot be so essential unto baptism, as for want of it to pronounce the baptism of all the reformed churches throughout the world to be null and void, as some among us do."†

The FOURTH WITNESS said, "The friendly address of Paul and Silas to the jailer, connected with the extraordinary interposition of God in their favour, seems to have been made effectual by the Holy Spirit at once to convince him that they were indeed 'the servants of the Most High God.'...They exhorted him 'to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ,' and assured him that in so doing he would certainly be saved. This faith implied a belief in their testimony concerning Jesus as the promised Messiah,...and a reliance on him for all things pertaining to salvation. They also included his household in this assurance; not that his faith could save them, but his example might lead them to believe in Christ also, and with him they would become part of the visible church, and have the benefit of the means of grace for their salvation. They then instructed him and all his family more fully into the doctrine of the gospel, and the Lord so blessed the word that he was immediately humbled, softened, and changed, from a lion as it were to a lamb... and then professing faith in Christ, he was baptized in his name.. and at the same time all his household was baptized likewise. Now, therefore,

* Acts ix. 18, 19. † Page 423.

...he brought them into his house, and entertained them at his table; at the same time his trembling was turned into joy. 'He rejoiced with all his' house, 'having believed in God.'...The language concerning the baptism of believers and their household so much accords with that concerning the circumcision of Abraham and his household, that in connexion with other scriptures, with the general and early use of infant baptism in the primitive church...must be allowed strongly to countenance the sentiments and practice of pedobaptists....It seems also most probable, to me at least, that Paul and Silas, in their painful condition, and in the jailer's house, did not baptize him and his family by immersion."

The FIFTH WITNESS said, "St. Paul declares to the jailer that in consequence of his own faith he and all his house should be saved. Should this, however, be contested, there is strong reason to believe that in some other of the families, and not improbably in all of them, were children too young to be baptized on their own profession of faith.

"It is objected, that children cannot be subjects of faith, and that faith is a necessary qualification for baptism.

"I know not how far this objection is urged, but it is certainly not founded in truth. *John the Baptist* was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb, and was unquestionably a subject of faith, in such a manner that, had he died in infancy, he would certainly have been received to heaven. What was true of him, can be true of any other infant. The objection therefore is founded in error.

"It is objected also, that infants cannot make a profession of faith, and that such a profession is a necessary qualification for baptism.

"That infants are unable to make a profession of faith is obvious, but that such a profession is a necessary qualification for baptism in all instances cannot be proved. *Cornelius, and they who were with him, made no such profession.* No profession was demanded by St. Peter, nor were any questions asked concerning the subject. They indeed gave evidence, and God furnished evidence for them, that they were true disciples of Christ. 'The Holy Spirit fell on them, and they spake with tongues, and magnified God.' These facts, and not a profession of faith, are alleged by St. Peter as the reason why he baptized them."*

* Vol. 2, page 524.

The SEVENTH WITNESS said, "When Lydia was baptized and her house, I no more believe that she and her family were immersed in the river where Paul and Silas went out to preach, than that the jailer and his family were immersed by Paul and Silas while yet in prison,—I say while yet in prison, because although the jailer, at the first alarm, is said to have 'brought them out,' it was evidently *out from the inner prison*, into which he had thrust them. He brought them from the inner prison into his house, where they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house; and where he washed their stripes, and was baptized, and where he set meat before them. The jailer's house, in which, on waking out of his sleep, he saw the prison doors open, was evidently connected with the prison, and it is accordingly said for the first time, at verse 40, 'they went out of the prison.'"*

"So," said the EIGHTH WITNESS, "that the jailer and his whole family, who were all taught, converted, and baptized about midnight, without any previous thought of, or preparation for, this ceremony, had it been done by dipping. As likewise that Saul, afterwards St. Paul, having neither eaten or drank for *three days before*, (Acts ix. 18,) and being greatly enfeebled by the mighty shock which he received from the vision in the way, as well as by the great remorse with which he reviewed and repented of his crimes, and it being now also in the depth of winter, about the 25th of January, as the learned have supposed, that in this weakly and enfeebled state, I say, 'he arose and was baptized,' by being totally put under water; and, finally, that the three thousand also, who were converted at Jerusalem, and baptized in one day, were all overwhelmed, seems, to say the least, to have scarce an air of probability."†

The NINTH WITNESS said, "With respect to the jailer," our opponents "tell us 'that we are expressly assured that the apostles spoke the word of the Lord to all that were in his house;' which we grant must principally, although not of necessity exclusively, refer to those who were of sufficient age to understand their discourse. And that 'he rejoiced, believing in God with all his house,' from which the inference is, that none but adult hearers, and adult believers, were in this case baptized. If so, then there could be no infant children in the house, which, as the jailer appears from his

* Page 172. † Page 105.

activity to have been a man in the vigour of life, and not aged, is at least far from being certain. But if it be a *proof* in this case, that there were no infant children in the jailer's family, that it is said he believed and *all his house*, this is not the only believing family mentioned in scripture from which infants must be excluded....

"In the case of the jailer's house, however, the baptist argument manifestly halts; for it is not said, that they only to whom the word of the Lord was spoken were baptized, nor that they only who 'believed' and 'rejoiced' with the jailor were baptized. The account of the baptism was given in a separate verse, and in different phrase; 'And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he *and all his*, all belonging to him, straightway;' where there is no limitation of the persons who were baptized to the adults only, by any terms which designate them as persons 'hearing' or 'believing.'"*

The Counsel for the Defendants addressed the Jury, saying:—

Gentlemen, allow me to call your particular attention to the few remarks I shall submit to you on the evidence you have just heard, as this is one of the principal clauses on which the Plaintiffs found their claim. You will remember that

The First Witness "did" at the commencement "run well, what did hinder him" from proceeding? He freely admitted that the jailer and all that were in his house were taught the words of the Lord, and were baptized in consequence of their faith. There is no proof here, gentlemen, that the children were baptized on account of the faith of their parents; and yet to establish this was the chief motive of the Plaintiff's appearing in Court. This Witness would have you believe that there was no immersion in the case, because "the general agitation and the necessity of despatch disprove it." In opposition to this view of the case, we maintain that it is evident, from the words of the text, that they were not baptized in the jailer's house; while, if they had been christened, surely the house would have been a more convenient place for despatch than taking

* Page 422.

them elsewhere. Wherever the Lord works, he stills agitation; and wherever genuine faith is, agitation gives place to joy.* Where, gentlemen, was the necessity for despatch? where the dread of publicity? Where, but in the imagination of man! Could not the Power that shook the earth, that loosed the prisoner's bands, and threw open the prison doors, have prevented interruption? Does this Witness imagine that his capacity can comprehend and define the work of God? Does he think "this thing was done in a corner," and without witnesses? If it had, it would have been contrary to the tenor of the Divine procedure. For we are not to suppose that Paul and Silas went over to Macedonia for the sole purpose of converting two households, but that they went to plant "the truth" there. For which end the power of God was manifested in a manner so miraculous. Nor would the miracle have answered its intended purpose, if the conversion that immediately ensued had not been witnessed by a great number of persons. That it was, I think we have no scriptural ground to doubt; for a church was very soon established at Philippi.† The Testator wills publicity.‡ He himself "before Pontius Pilate (and before his determined enemies who then surrounded him,) witnessed a good confession."§ In the case of the jailer, we have an instance of this publicity. The doors of the prison were not opened to liberate Paul and Silas from their captivity, as was the case when the apostles were liberated from the prison in Jerusalem.‖ No, gentlemen, they remained in the prison until the magistrates "came and besought them, and brought them out." Some other purpose, doubtless, was to be promoted, namely, that the jailer and his house might, in the presence of many witnesses, confess, and be baptized. As I have before observed, it is manifest that they were not baptized in the jailer's house, for the baptism had taken place before he brought Paul and Silas into it. It is manifest also that the magistrates were cognizant of the proceedings of the night, or how would they have imagined that the great miracle had taken place merely because they had imprisoned Paul and Silas, when in respect of their bands, and the doors of their cells being opened,¶ there was no difference between them and the other prisoners—all were alike set free. But they had had convincing evidence that they were "the servants of the Most High God," or why did they send as soon as it was day to liberate

* Psalm xliii. 4. † Phil. iv. 15. ‡ Matt. x. 32; 1 Tim. vi. 12.
§ 1 Tim. vi. 13. ‖ Acts. v. 19. ¶ Verse 26.

them? From the recital of the facts of this interesting circumstance we may very safely conclude that the ordinance of baptism was orderly and openly administered, "before many witnesses;" and whether the jailer and his house went outside the prison to be baptized, or were baptized within it, the doors being open would alike facilitate either the individuals going out to make a profession before the public, or the public entering to witness it. Independent of this, the prisoners must have witnessed it; being at liberty, they would naturally flock round the men who, immediately after the awful and impressive incident which had just occurred, were calmly teaching "the way of salvation" to the jailer and his family. But when the apostles were liberated at Jerusalem, the case was widely different; neither the jailer nor the authorities were cognizant of it. At the very time the magistrates sent to bring them up from the prison, they were "standing in the temple and teaching the people;"* thus publicly declaring their divine mission. It is a reasonable conclusion, then, that the prison doors at Philippi were opened, not only for the purpose of publicly showing the miraculous conversion of the jailer and his house, but to manifest to the world that the apostles were divinely commissioned.

One principal object of the ordinance of baptism we hold to be, that it should be administered openly, before men; in order that the converts might, by being baptized on a public profession of their faith in Christ, witness to the world that they separate themselves from it—that they are no longer the servants of sin, but "the servants of righteousness;† and that they might, by gathering "themselves together unto him," as did the tribe of Levi,‡ profess their allegiance to their Divine Master. And, gentlemen, if there be in an individual any evasion of publicity, no matter how speciously it may be devised, be assured that the evasion is indicative of being ashamed of Christ; and baptism under such circumstances can never be acceptable to him.§

When a convert is desirous of giving himself to God, it is according to the gospel plan that he should, in the first place, avow his repentance, confess his sins, profess his faith, and declare before the members of the church what the Lord hath done for his soul;‖ in order that they, by what his lips may utter, may judge if he has been made meet to be partaker "of the inheritance of the saints in

* Acts v. 20. 25. † Rom. vi. 17, 18. ‡ Exodus xxxii. 26.
§ See Mark viii. 38. ‖ Ps. lxvi. 16.

light,"* and thus to be made with themselves one body. The apostolic caution is, "Lay hands suddenly on no man."† If the judgment of the church be favourable, he is accepted of it. But this is only for the satisfaction of the church,—which is a private assembly, sitting with closed doors,—and can never be the open public profession before men which the Testator requires, and of which we read so much.‡ A confession "with the mouth," at the water side, whether the ordinance be administered in the open air, or in a place of worship when the doors are thrown open, is certainly in accordance with that made before John, the Testator, and the apostles; and also with what Paul says to Timothy, in his first epistle;§ while the import of the words "before men," in Matt. x. 32, is the same as in Matt. v. 16. It must also be observed, that in the former part of the preceding chapter, the Testator gives explicit directions to his apostles, how they were to conduct themselves among the unbelieving Jews, to whom he was about to send them—and whom he compared to wolves—Jews, who would deliver them to councils—Jews, who would scourge them in the synagogues. It was before men like these that their converts were to witness with "their mouths"‖ a good profession, previous to their going down into the water.

I admit that a public profession of Christianity requires strong faith, and christian courage; for all must allow, that it is an awful and fearful thing for a convert, in the presence of the world, to give himself up to the Lord, and to his church. Yet when his heart is right with God, the assurance that eternal glory will be the result, nerves him with fortitude to overcome all obstacles, and, with becoming boldness, to confess "that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."¶ And he thus avows, that he is not only not ashamed of Christ and his words,** but that he believes his declaration, "Whosoever ... shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in heaven."††

It has often been objected, that such a public profession is too trying an ordeal for delicate females; but the objection has no force, since females are subject to the same laws, the same ordinances, the same blessings, and the same threatenings, as the

* Col. i. 12.
† 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 John iv. 1.
‡ See Matt. iii. 6; x. 32; John xii. 42; Acts xix. 18; Rom. x. 9, 10; Phil. ii. 11; 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13; 1 John i. 9; iv. 15; 2 John 7.
§ 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13.
‖ Rom. x. 10.
¶ Acts viii. 37.
** Luke ix. 26.
†† Matt. x. 32.

males; and are gifted with as much self-possession and resolution; indeed, in numerous instances, with more: and I have yet to hear of a female who is too delicate to make a public profession of obedience to the man she loves. The Testator's words, as recorded by the evangelists,* clearly imply that a public profession requires courage, as it was intended to be a test of faith; and we may safely conclude that, immediately after the martyrdom of Stephen, it was, in and around Jerusalem, an infallible one. Happily the times are changed; and now, having confidence and humble boldness to "lay hold on eternal life,"† all the courage required is to encounter a false shame, the disdain and derision of the world, and "to go forth unto Jesus without the camp, bearing his reproach."‡ And, gentlemen, if there be any in this court, whether male or female, whose eyes have been opened to see that there is forgiveness and salvation for them in Christ Jesus, but who still hesitate to avail themselves of the privilege of this ordinance, they may be well assured, that, however formidable in anticipation the ordeal may appear,—and anticipation generally exceeds reality,—it is less than nothing, when compared with the fiery ordeal and dreadful sentence that awaits the wilfully disobedient.§

After this short digression, for which, I trust, the importance of the subject will be a sufficient excuse, allow me again to call your attention to the evidence of

The First Witness, who said, "It being the dead of the night, disproves that they were immersed." How can this disprove it? The light of day is not required, for one man to see to baptize another. But could not the moon have been shining, or the stars giving their light? However this may have been, we may fearlessly assert, that, the baptism being of the Lord, it was accomplished in due order.‖ The Divine Founder of the ordinance always finds means by which to accomplish his designs: as it is declared in Isaiah xliii. 13, "I will work, and who shall let it?" Then said the Witness again, "The words of the text all disprove it." Disprove what? That they were immersed? Certainly the words of the text disprove his assertion. "He took them," say they, "the same hour of the night, and *washed* their stripes, and was *baptized*, he and all his straightway."

Gentlemen, the evidence which you have already heard, will have

* Matt. x. 22, 23, and Mark viii. 38. † 1 Tim. vi. 12.
‡ Heb. xiii. 13. § See Matt. xxv. 41. ‖ See 1 Cor. xiv. 33.

been sufficient to convince you, that those who are by the Eighth Witness denominated "the learned," are, in things concerning the kingdom of God, often found to be fools. What says Paul to them? "If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, let him become a fool, that he may be wise: (*i. e.*, that he may be convinced of his insufficiency in the knowledge of spiritual things:) for the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God."*

How the First Witness dare assert that the apostles had another method of administering baptism I cannot conceive, when Paul, who was a party to the transaction before us, positively declares there is only ONE baptism;† and one baptism can only be administered in one way; while this Witness has himself repeatedly told you, that that one way is plunging. So that you may gather from his own evidence that the jailer and all his were plunged.

The Second Witness does not deny the lawfulness of what he calls "baptizing by immersion," although he implies that, in this respect, the command is not absolute. But you know, gentlemen, that the command is absolute—that it is binding on every believer—and that the promise of eternal life is to those only who "believe and are baptized."‡ The commandment to baptize, and the promise to the baptized, are irrevocable. "Heaven and earth," says the Testator, "shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."§ "God is the Lord, and changes not."‖ Peter would surely not have commanded Cornelius and his friends to be baptized with water, after they had been baptized with the Holy Ghost, and had thus received the mighty promise which was previously consequent on it, unless it were indispensable to all believers.¶ Yes, gentlemen, it is indispensable. The converts could not have been reckoned among the sheep of Christ, until they had been inducted into his fold, the only entrance into which is baptism; while the gift of tongues, conferred upon them, was a convincing proof that they were prepared to follow their Great Shepherd, in "fulfilling all righteousness." Belief and baptism are linked together by a chain which can never be sundered; and it may be said of them, as it is said of marriage; "What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."** Those who hold that baptism, as commanded by the Testator, may be dispensed with, may as well hold that faith may be dispensed with likewise; they have no more authority to

* 1 Cor. iii. 18, 19. † Ephes. iv. 5. ‡ Mark xvi. 16; John iii. 3—6.
§ Mark xiii. 31. ‖ Mal. iii. 6. ¶ Acts ii. 38. ** Matt. xix. 6.

dispense with the one than they have to dispense with the other. The Testator said, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." Now, has he not laid as much stress on the word "baptized," as he has upon the word "believeth"? And can any of these Witnesses, or any of their constituents, prove from the Will that, since the Testator issued his commission, one unbaptized sinner has been saved? "He that rejecteth me," saith the Lord, "and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him at the last day."* And is not his commission the leading and most important part of "the word"? Again; "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him."†

The sentiments I have advanced will undoubtedly be regarded as "hard sayings;" but it must be proved that they are contrary to the gospel, before they can safely be rejected, and it will be well for my fellow men to ponder them in their hearts. A servant of Christ must not, when his Master's cause is in jeopardy, shrink from danger, nor conceal his views of "the way of salvation:" whatever may be the consequence, he is bound to declare them openly;‡ while what is recorded of Phineas, in the Book of Numbers, xxv. 6—13, and what is said to Paul, Acts xviii. 9, 10, affords ample encouragement for him to act and speak boldly, and not to be afraid.

According to the statement of this Witness, which is a manifest corruption of the text, Paul baptized the jailer's family, being satisfied with his sole proxy; yet, strange to relate, this Witness, when he christens an infant, requires three proxies. In this, therefore, there is great inconsistency. Had this Witness been familiar with the apostle's character, he would not have brought forward the flimsy excuse that he would not go into the water because of his sore back. Paul had a constitution of iron, and, when engaged in his Master's work, the courage of a lion. Would he have refrained, then, on *that* account? Or would he, who afterward suffered so much to promote the salvation of others, have shrunk, however weak he might have been, from going down into the water to promote his own? Oh no, gentlemen; he is dishonoured by the supposition.

We, gentlemen, are of those who pronounce the baptism (as it is

* John xii. 48. † John xiv. 21. ‡ See Jer. xxvi. 2.

called) of the reformed churches to be null and void. In the scriptural sense of the term, and considered as the christian initiatory ordinance, we believe baptism to be the putting a believer, after he has confessed his Lord, under water. To this view of it the Witness himself has subscribed, as in the case of the eunuch. We contend that this *only* is baptism; and that this baptism is required by the Testator of every believer, before he is authorised by the Will to sit at the table of the Great King,* or to claim the heavenly inheritance.† Without dread of contradiction, this I openly, fearlessly, and advisedly assert. It is useless, then, to dwell upon this part of the evidence of this Witness; it furnishes you only with probabilities and improbabilities, in addition to the ifs and presumptions of the witness who preceded him.

Gentlemen, careless hearers might imagine that the evidence given by the Fourth Witness was a fair and scriptural account of the transaction; but you, who are attentive, must have discovered his disingenuousness. He said that the baptism of the households, with the general and early use of infant baptism, strongly countenances the practice of pedobaptists. Observe, gentlemen, *strongly* countenances *only*. And this is evidence! This, which he cannot reconcile to himself; or why does he transpose and interpolate the text? This, doubtless, is an "unintentional mistake"! this is done "from proper motives, with a sincere desire to establish truth"! Can he appeal to "his heart-searching Judge, that he has spoken word for word what he believes he would have him speak"? Mark, gentlemen, his transposition—"The jailer rejoiced, with all his 'house,' having believed in God;" thus insinuating, that though the whole family rejoiced, yet the jailer only believed. But, as is generally the case with those who wish to withhold the whole truth, he betrays himself by inadvertent expressions; for he says that Paul and Silas "instructed the jailer and *all* his family into the doctrines of the gospel." We must therefore conclude, even from his own lips, not only that if the jailer had any children, they were of age to receive instruction; but that, as they also had witnessed the immediate interposition of almighty power as well as the jailer himself, they too were converted to the faith, and made a confession of it. You observed, gentlemen, how he kept up a marked distinction between the jailer and all that were in his house. He only it was that was humbled, softened, and changed: he only professed

* Acts ii. 41, 42. 47. † John iii. 5; 1 John iv. 2, 3.

his faith, and was baptized. But nothing of this is said of the others, except that they were baptized at the same time. And what pusillanimity, also, pervades his evidence. In this instance, even when it seems most probable to him that the jailer and his family were not immersed, he dared not assert that they were affused. In fact, gentlemen, the burden of this Witness' evidence is, like that of all the other Witnesses, a feeble effort to prove a negative.

The Fifth Witness attempts to show, that, according to the instance of Cornelius, a profession is not in all cases a necessary qualification for baptism; and also here, that faith is not; because it is said of John, that "he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb." But this is nothing to the purpose, gentlemen; what is said of John, is said of him as the great precursor of the Testator, and not as an ordinary child. But even this is not to be understood literally, from the day of his birth; but from the time that he was capable of understanding; as it is said of him, "the child grew, and waxed strong in spirit, and was in the desert, *till the day* of his showing unto Israel."* This Witness is of opinion, that what was true of John can be true of any other infant. If this be his opinion, why then does he not act upon it, and not refuse to christen children whom he deems not born of christian parents? But why does he christen them at all, gentlemen? He reads nothing of John christening infants; and all infants being alike, those that die in infancy must, according to his own showing, even whether christened or not, die as John would have died, had he died in childhood.

John was brought into the world for a specific purpose; it is evident, therefore, that he could not have died in infancy. Still, all who die in that state leave the world as pure as John himself was, before he was capable of committing sin. "For where no law is, there is no transgression."† And "sin is not imputed, where there is no law."‡ I presume, gentlemen, that it would be a difficult matter to persuade this Witness that the least saint now living is greater than John was, while living on the earth.§

This Witness does not give his authority for what he asserts of Cornelius and his friends not making a profession at their baptism;

* Luke i. 80.
† Rom. iv. 15.
‡ Rom. v. 13.
§ Matt. xi. 11.

therefore his bare assertion cannot be taken as evidence. They were baptized "in the name of the Lord," and doubtless made that confession of faith in his name which others had made, who had been baptized before them. It is said, that they magnified God:* and I do not see how they could magnify him, without confessing their faith in his well-beloved Son,† and acknowledging their "redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace.‡ We find confession of sin, and profession of faith, mentioned in connexion with baptism; and although they are not invariably mentioned, it ought not thence to be inferred that they are not required. On the contrary, their being mentioned, and being in conformity with the tenor of the gospel, is authority sufficient for their requirement of every convert. As to infants making a confession by proxy,—or, as is the custom in "high places," by the proxy of a proxy,—the wonder is, how any person, in this so-termed enlightened age, could conceive of such a thing, much less act as if he thought it possible. "The customs of the people are vain."§

This Witness, gentlemen, like the preceding one, misquotes the text. He would have you believe that Paul and Silas told the jailer that if he only believed, he and all his house should, in consequence of his faith, be saved; but the context proves the contrary. There is nothing said of children, either young or old; and his house was as likely to consist of turnkeys as of children. Conscience hinted to the Witness that he was "adding to" the text, or he would not have eaten his words, but have boldly declared his belief that the jailer had children, and that, in consequence of his believing for them, they were baptized.

The Seventh Witness, following the example of the two preceding ones, transposes the text, in order to make it appear that the jailer brought Paul and Silas from the inner prison immediately into his house, where they spake to him and all that were in his house—where he washed their stripes, and was baptized. This, as you know, gentlemen, is not the true reading. He did not bring them into his house till these things had been accomplished. But, in addition to bringing them out of the inner prison, where he had thrust them,‖ it is said, he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straight-

* Acts x. 46. † See Phil. ii. 11. ‡ Eph. i. 7.
§ Jer. x. 3. ‖ Verse 24.

way." Now arises the question, Where did he take them? It is not required of us to prove, either that he took them to another part of the prison, where there was water, or outside the prison walls. It is sufficient for our cause that the Will declares the word was spoken to all of them, and that they were all baptized. What is said in the 40th verse, is not connected with the transactions of the preceding night. This Witness does not believe that the jailer and his house were immersed. Mark the authority, gentlemen!

Gentlemen, you could not fail to observe how studiously the Eighth Witness eluded this text. It is true, he did acknowledge that the jailer's family were all taught and instructed; but the fact of their baptism being too stubborn a thing for him to encounter, he flew off to the baptism of Saul and the three thousand. The shock which Saul received on his journey to Damascus, and the remorse he felt, aptly illustrate the feelings of the sinner when brought to the true knowledge of his state; when he sees that unless his sins be pardoned, he is doomed to eternal punishment. And although the conviction may not generally come so suddenly as that of Paul's, it sinks as deep into the heart; and although the sufferings may not be so acute, they frequently continue longer than his, and consequently are as galling to the conscience. What man, then, would not, under any feebleness of body, even on the "25th of January," with a similar assurance of pardon as Paul had, arise and be baptized, that he might figuratively have both his sins and his sufferings washed away together? The conclusion of this Witness, gentlemen, is worthy of especial remark, as if his *ipse dixit* would carry you away with him. "I SAY, that the immersion of Paul, and the three thousand, have scarce any air of probability." Behold then, gentlemen, another specimen of the evidence which the *elite* of his sect think so worthy of circulation; and that upon a clause which is regarded as one of the chief pillars of their creed!

The Ninth Witness, like the Eighth, finds the facts stated in this clause too pointed for him, and is therefore fain to follow in the wake of the Fifth, and leap over them to the other clauses, where families are mentioned. It would be hard for him to say where he got his information that the jailer was an active man; and if he was, would that either determine his age, or prove that he had children? "The account of the baptism," says he, "is given in a different verse, and in a different phrase — that it is not said that they *only*," &c. I see not the necessity of its being so said, when it is particu-

larly declared that *all* in the house were spoken to, and that all were baptized. That the Plaintiffs feel that they have no claim under the Will is manifested by the puerility of their statements in their attempt to enforce it. The gist of their evidence is nothing more than a feeble attempt to disprove ours; and feeble indeed it is, as I shall convince you by summing it up:—

The First Witness said, It is by *no means likely* that there was any immersion in the case.

The Second, How *improbable* it is that the jailer and his house were baptized by dipping.

The Fourth, It seems *most probable* that they were not "baptized by immersion."

The Fifth, There is *strong reason* to believe that in *some other* of the families, and not *improbably* in all, there were children too young to be baptized on their own profession.

The Seventh, does *not believe* that the jailer was immersed!

The Eighth, It seems to have scarce an *air of probability* that they were overwhelmed.

The Ninth, This is *not the only believing family* from which infants must be excluded.

Now, gentlemen, this is one of the principal clauses upon which our opponents build their hopes; they came here to prove what they call the "mode" of baptism, and that, according to the Will, infants are proper subjects of it; and I put it to you, and to every man of common sense who hears me, to say whether, from the evidence you have just heard, the most distant idea can be formed whether the jailer had or had not children; or, if he had, whether they and he were baptized, rhantized, or effused?

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON THE BAPTISM OF CRISPUS AND HIS HOUSE.—ACTS XVIII. 8.

"And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord, with all his house."

The First Witness said, "'Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord, with all his house: and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized.' This person held an office of considerable consequence, and therefore his conversion to christianity must have been very galling to the Jews:... and 'many of the Corinthians,' those to whom the sacred historian refers, were probably Gentiles, and were the fruits of the apostle's labours, after he had ceased to preach among the Jews."

"Note," gentlemen, said the Second Witness, "the good success which the apostle had in his preaching at Corinth....Crispus...and his household were brought to believe, and were baptized; after whose example, many of the people in Corinth believed also. Rulers and great men are like looking-glasses in the places where they live, by which many dress themselves."*

The Fourth Witness said, "It is probable that the apostle continued to lodge and work with Aquila and Priscilla, though he no more preached in the synagogue, but used the house of a Gentile. ...This circumstance might tend to give the Jews who desired it an opportunity of still attending his preaching. Indeed, several of them had already embraced the gospel, especially the chief ruler of the synagogue with all his family, and many afterwards were converted and received into the church by baptism, both of the Jews and Gentiles."†

* Page 430. † Acts xviii. 7, 8.

The Counsel for the Defendants replied,—

Gentlemen of the Jury, I cannot but regard it as passing strange that only three of the Witnesses should speak on this fact, and that the evidence of these three should be fatal to the Plaintiffs: and I think we may very safely conclude that the others, finding they could not gainsay what the First, Second, and Fourth advanced, deemed it more prudent to be silent, lest they also should prejudice their cause.

If it be true, as the Second Witness has stated, that rulers and great men are like looking-glasses, it must then naturally follow that such rulers and great men as these Witnesses and their constituents are responsible for the errors of their people, as it is by them, their looking-glasses, that they dress themselves.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON THE BAPTISM OF STEPHANAS.—1 COR. I. 16.

"AND I BAPTIZED ALSO THE HOUSEHOLD OF STEPHANAS; BESIDES, I KNOW NOT WHETHER I BAPTIZED ANY OTHER."

The FIRST WITNESS said, "From 1 Cor. i. 16, we learn that the family of Stephanas were the *first converts* of Achaia, probably converted and baptized by the apostle himself....They had been the chief instruments of supporting the work of God in Achaia, of which work they themselves were the first-fruits."*

The SECOND WITNESS said, "That though baptizing was God's ordinance, and St. Paul, as Christ's minister, had a commission and sufficient authority to baptize, yet the providence of God so ordered that he baptized very few, lest any should say that he baptized in

* 1 Cor. xvi. 15.

his own name. Among those few he baptized, here is a whole household mentioned, the household of Stephanas.*...St. Paul makes honourable mention of Stephanas and his house; they were the first-fruits of Achaia, *i. e.*, the first there converted to christianity."†

The Fourth Witness said, "Stephanas seems to have been with the apostle at Ephesus, when he wrote this; but his household and family remained at Corinth. The several persons belonging to his family were qualified for usefulness, and ought to have possessed great influence in the church, as they were the oldest converts to christianity in all Achaia, and as they had habitually devoted themselves to every service by which they could minister to the good of their brethren. The apostle therefore besought the christians at Corinth to submit themselves to the counsel, influence, or ministry of this family."‡

The Ninth Witness said, "This family...it is argued, must have been all adults, because they are said to have 'addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints,'§ and further, because they were persons who took *a lead* in the affairs of the church, the Corinthians being exhorted to 'submit themselves unto such, and to every one that helpeth with us and laboureth.' To understand this passage rightly, it is however necessary to observe, that Stephanas, the head of this family, had been sent by the church of Corinth to St. Paul at Ephesus, along with Fortunatus and Achaicus. In the absence of the head of the family, the apostle commends 'the house,' the family of Stephanas, to the regard of the Corinthian believers, and perhaps also the houses of the two other brethren who had come with him....

"By the house or family of Stephanas, the apostle must mean his children, or, along with them, his near relations dwelling together in the same family; for since they are commended for their hospitality to the saints, servants, who have no power to show hospitality, are of course excluded. But in the absence of the head of the family, it is very improbable that the apostle should exhort the Corinthian church to 'submit' ecclesiastically to the wife, sons and daughters, and near relations of Stephanas....In respect of government, therefore, they cannot be supposed 'to have had *a lead* in the church,' according to the Baptist notion, and especially as the heads of these

* Page 543. † Page 601. ‡ 1 Cor. xvi. 15—18. § 1 Cor. xvi. 15.

families were absent. They were, however, the oldest christian families in Corinth, the house of Stephanas at least being called 'the first-fruits of Achaia,' and eminently distinguished for addicting themselves, *setting themselves on system*, to the work of ministering to the saints, *i. e.*, of communicating to the poor saints, entertaining stranger christians, which was an important branch of practical duty in the primitive church, that in every place those who professed Christ might be kept out of the society of idolators, and receiving the ministers of Christ. On these accounts the apostle commends them to the special regard of the Corinthian church....These families were the oldest christians in Corinth, and as they were foremost in every good word and work, they were not only to be commended, but the rest were to be exhorted to serve under them as leaders in these works of charity. This appears to be the obvious sense of this otherwise obscure passage. But in this, or indeed in any other sense which can be given to it, it proves no more than that there were adult persons in the family of Stephanas,—his wife, sons, and daughters, who were distingushed for their charity and hospitality. Still it is to be remembered, that the baptism of the oldest of the children took place several years before. The house of Stephanas 'was the first-fruits of Achaia,' in which St. Paul began to preach not later than A. D. 51, whilst this epistle could not be written earlier at least than A.D. 57, and might be later. Six or eight years taken from the age of the sons and daughters of Stephanas, might bring the oldest to the state of early youth, and as the younger branches would descend to the term of infancy properly so called. Still further, all that the apostle affirms of the benevolence and hospitality of the family of Stephanas is perfectly consistent with a part of his children being still very young when he wrote the epistle. An equal commendation for hospitality and charity might be given in the present day, with perfect propriety, to many pious families, several members of which are still in a state of infancy. It was sufficient to warrant the use of such expressions as those of the apostle, that there were 'in this Corinthian family' a few adults, whose conduct gave a decided character to the whole 'house.' Thus the arguments used to prove in 'these three instances' of family baptism there were no young children, are evidently very unsatisfactory; and they leave us to the conclusion, which perhaps all would come to in reading the sacred history were they quite free from the bias of theory, that 'houses' or 'families,' as in the common received import of the

term, must be understood to comprise children of all ages, unless some explicit note of the contrary appears, which is not the case in any instances in question."*

Here, gentlemen, said the Counsel for the Defendants, you have two of the Witnesses testifying that the family of Stephanas were all converted to christianity; and one of the two, that all the family were probably *converted* and baptized by the apostle himself. Thus they allow the clause its true and simple meaning, and concede the point in question, that in this family there were no young children. Other two of the Witnesses also allow that this family was composed of the oldest christians in Corinth.

But, gentlemen, hath not the Ninth Witness spoken without knowledge, "and were not his words without wisdom"?† "How forcible are right words! but what doth" his "arguing reprove?"‡ There can be no doubt, gentlemen, that the arguments to prove that there were no children in the instances of family baptisms mentioned in the Will are very unsatisfactory, to him who has been nurtured in the belief that infants are the proper subjects of baptism. But the account of Stephanas and his family is given in so clear a manner as to convince every unprejudiced mind that at the time it was written Stephanas had no young children. The argument, says this Witness, leads us to the conclusion that *perhaps* all would come to in reading the scripture, were they quite free from the bias of a theory. But, gentlemen, it is hardly doubtful whether he is quite free from the bias of a theory, when he says that wherever the terms house or household are mentioned, they indicate that there were in them children of all ages.

Nothing can be plainer, gentlemen, than the words of the gospel, which this Witness denominates obscure. "I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first-fruits of Achaia, and that *they* have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints,) that ye submit yourselves unto such, and to every one that helpeth with us and laboureth." Being the first-fruits of Achaia, it follows that they were the oldest members of the church, and

* Pages 424—426. † Job xxxiv. 35. ‡ Job vi. 25.

fellow-labourers with the apostle in the gospel vineyard. Not, as this Witness would have you believe, in temporal matters only, but in every thing that pertains to the ministry of Christ. For which reason, as is manifest in the text, the brethren were exhorted to submit themselves unto them. And nothing can be more unreasonable than the attempt of this Witness to prove, from the circumstances of Paul beginning to preach in Achaia, A.D. 51, and the epistle being written A.D. 57, that Stephanas had a wife, and sons, and daughters, some of them in an infantile state.

According to him, to understand the passage rightly it is necessary to observe, that Stephanas had been sent to Paul at Ephesus; that in the absence of the head of the family, the apostle commended "the house to the regard of the Corinthian believers." But, gentlemen, the very contrary is the true reading, and to this view of it even the Fourth Witness assents. The Corinthians were to submit to the house, not to take charge of it. Another stumbling-block in his way is, that as "servants have no power to show hospitality, they are of course excluded." But how can this be? Joseph was Potiphar's servant, nay, his slave, bought with his money; and yet Joseph declares that "Potiphar had committed all that he had into his hands." Was he not therefore at liberty to show hospitality to whom he pleased, much more to his master's friends? Surely, then, these christian servants, who were the Lord's free men, might, in the absence of their masters, have the same liberty.

There is nothing in the text from which we can gather whether this "house" was composed of grown-up sons, of relatives, or of servants, or of all three. But the testimony of Paul himself, who baptized them,* is amply sufficient to establish our cause. He says, "that in every thing they were enriched by him (the Testator) in all utterance and in all knowledge, even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in them, so that they came behind in no gift."†

Gentlemen, it is not difficult to say what treatment a witness in a civil cause would receive, if declaring upon oath that he knew the number, age, aye and sex too, of a man's legitimate children, yet on his cross-examination, could not so much as prove that the man had a child, or even that he had been married. His evidence would be regarded as utterly worthless. And yet, in this momentous cause, the learned Judge, and you, gentlemen of the Jury, are compelled

* 1 Cor. i. 16. † 1 Cor. i. 5—7.

to listen patiently to such unwarrantable statements, by which the opponents of TRUTH expose the fallacy of their own arguments, and thus put the world on its guard against their vanities.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON THE BAPTISM OF LYDIA AND HER HOUSEHOLD.—ACTS XVI. 14, 15.

"AND A CERTAIN WOMAN NAMED LYDIA, A SELLER OF PURPLE, OF THE CITY OF THYATIRA, WHICH WORSHIPPED GOD, HEARD US; WHOSE HEART THE LORD OPENED THAT SHE ATTENDED UNTO THE THINGS WHICH WERE SPOKEN OF PAUL. AND WHEN SHE WAS BAPTIZED AND HER HOUSEHOLD, SHE BESOUGHT US SAYING, IF YE HAVE JUDGED ME TO BE FAITHFUL TO THE LORD, COME INTO MY HOUSE, AND ABIDE THERE."

The FIRST WITNESS said, "As she was a sincere worshipper of God, she was prepared to receive the heavenly truths spoken by Paul and his companions; and as she was *faithful* to the grace she had received, so God gave her more grace, and gave her now a divine conviction that what was spoken by Paul was true, and therefore *she attended unto the things*, she believed them, and received them as the doctrines of God; and in this faith she was joined by her whole family, and in it they were baptized."

The SECOND WITNESS said, "Lydia, by reason of her faith in Christ, having a right to baptism, all her family, upon her undertaking to bring them up in the knowledge of Christ, were admitted to the ordinance with her....The opening of the heart to receive Jesus Christ is the peculiar effect of the sovereign power and omnipotent grace of God."*

The FOURTH WITNESS—"Lydia was led to embrace the gospel, and was baptized with her household, the adult part of which no doubt were instructed in christianity along with her. There is no

* Page 422.

proof that there were any children in her family, though it is probable there were. The Syriac version, indeed, renders it 'the children of her house;' but this only shows the sentiments of those who made that early translation; and the language here used seems not capable of being consistently used in the narratives of those who reject infant baptism."*

The SIXTH WITNESS said, "To an unprejudiced reader of the New Testament it must, I think, be equally clear, that the baptism of families is mentioned in a way that indicates its being no *extraordinary* occurrence, but *a thing of course.* This is remarkably the case as to Lydia. 'The Lord opened her heart,' &c....I cannot but consider any person unreasonable who will not admit, that the mode of expression here is one which would naturally be used respecting a thing that was customary. And it is worthy of notice, moreover, that the baptism of her family is immediately connected in the record with *her own* reception of the truth; and that upon *her own* faithfulness to the Lord she founds her plea for their coming under her roof. Similar remarks might be made as to the case of the jailer, who was baptized, '*he and all his*, straightway.'

"Having thus the unquestionable fact of the *baptism of families*, a fact according with the ancient practice of the circumcision of families, and supported by the use of a word that properly denotes a man's children or offspring, we are warranted to assume that such was the usual practice, unless our Baptist brethren can show that the case of Lydia, the jailer, and Stephanas were, in the circumstances of them, *extraordinary*, and therefore not fair specimens of what was customary. Here is the turning point on this part of the argument; if they cannot make out this, or if they cannot make it out without unnatural straining and inadmissible suppositions, our ground is firm."†

"Nothing can be more direct and obvious," said the SEVENTH WITNESS, "than the argument from scripture for infant baptism. It rests on the simple principle, that the history of the Acts of the Apostles is of the same authority with that of the four Gospels....

"As the court is probably aware, I refer to the well known fact that, according to the history of the Acts of the Apostles, baptism was administered to believers and their houses....The first case of family baptism is that of Cornelius and his family, the second is

* Acts xvi. 15. † Page 126.

that of Lydia and her family, and the third that of the jailer and his family....The fourth is that of the family of Stephanas....Of the probability of more cases being expressly mentioned in scripture I shall say, as Paul does of the numbers he baptized at Corinth, 'Besides, I know not whether there be any other.'

"In the account given of the cases mentioned above, it is evident that the administration of baptism to families was nothing new. They were not singular cases, or rare cases, or cases to be accounted for and justified by any peculiarity of circumstances, such as had not happened before, and might not soon happen again....

"Although, therefore, it is in the Acts of the Apostles that family baptism is first mentioned, it was not for the first time then practised. There is but 'one baptism,' Eph. iv. 5, in the church of God; and, from first to last in scripture history, there is no reason to doubt that it was administered in one way. On these grounds we are supported in holding that family baptism was practised from the beginning.... *

"When Lydia was baptized, with her house, we are made certain that they were none of them believers excepting herself; for she urged christian character, as the argument for prevailing with Paul and Silas to accept her hospitality." †

The EIGHTH WITNESS said, "The instance of Lydia, not to mention Stephanas and the jailer, strongly favours our practice; whose faith ALONE is mentioned, and immediately it is added, *her household were baptized.*" ‡

The NINTH WITNESS said, "The words of the writer of the Acts are, 'who, when she was baptized, and her *house*.' The great difficulty with the Baptists is, to make a house for Lydia without any children at all, young or old. This, however, cannot be proved from the term itself, since the same word is that commonly used in scripture to include children residing at home with their parents. 'One that ruleth well his own *house*, having his *children* in subjection with all gravity.'...

"All, however, that the history states is, that 'the Lord opened Lydia's heart, that she attended to the things which were spoken of Paul;' and that she was therefore 'baptized, and her house.' From this house no one has the least authority to exclude children, even

* Pages 178—180. † Page 189. ‡ Page 63.

young children, since there is nothing in the history to warrant the above-mentioned conjectures, and the word is in scripture used expressly to include them. All is perfectly gratuitous on the part of the Baptists; but whilst there is nothing to sanction the manner in which they deal with this text, there is a circumstance strongly confirmatory of the probability that the house of Lydia, according to the natural import of the word rendered house or family, contained children, and that in an infantile state; this is, that in all the other instances, in which adults are mentioned as having been baptized along with the head of a family, they are mentioned as 'hearing' and 'believing,' or in some terms which amount to this. Cornelius had called together 'his kinsmen and near friends;' and while Peter spake, 'the Holy Ghost fell on all them *which heard the word*.' 'And he commanded them to be baptized.' So the adults in the house of the jailer...were persons to whom 'the word of the Lord' was spoken; and although nothing is said of the faith of any but the jailer himself,—for the words are more properly rendered, 'and he, believing in God, rejoiced with all his house,'—yet is the joy which appears to have been felt by the adult part of the house, as well as by himself, to be attributed to their faith. Now, as it does not appear that the apostles, although they baptized infant children, baptized unbelieving adult servants, because their masters or mistresses believed, and yet the *house* of Lydia were baptized along with herself, when no mention at all is made of the Lord 'opening the heart' of these adult domestics, nor of their believing, the fair inference is, that the 'house' of Lydia means her children only, and that, being of immature years, they were baptized with their mother, according to the common custom of the Jews to baptize the children of the proselyted Gentiles along with their parents, from which practice christian baptism appears to have been taken.*...

"But let the cases of the baptism of *houses* mentioned in the New Testament, be put in the most favourable light for the purpose of the Baptists, that is, let them be considered as insulated and peculiar, and not as *instances* of apostolic procedure in all cases where the heads of families were converted to the faith, still the Baptist is obliged to assume that neither in the house of the jailer, nor in that of Lydia, nor in that of Stephanas were there any infants at all, since if there were, they were comprehended in the *whole*

* Page 423.

houses which were baptized upon the believing of their respective heads. This at least is improbable, and no intimation of this peculiarity is given in the history.

"The Defendants, however, think that they can prove that all the persons included in these houses were adults; and that the means of showing this from the scriptures is an instance of 'the care of providence watching over the sacred cause of adult baptism;' thus absurdly assuming that even if this point could be made out, the whole controversy is terminated, when in fact this is but an auxiliary argument, of very inferior importance to those before mentioned."*

Gentlemen of the Jury, said the Counsel for the Defendants,—the evidence you have just heard is upon a very important clause; one on which our opponents have erected a fortress that they deem impregnable. Even the Sixth Witness, who had not the courage to face the account given of the jailer and Stephanas, here claps his wings, and thinks himself secure. But, gentlemen, duty imposes upon me the task, although at the risque of being thought *unreasonable*, of proving that his position is not tenable.

That there is no more evidence, gentlemen, of there having been unbelievers in Lydia's family, than there is of there having been unbelievers in any of the others, requires no proof. Indeed, the subjects of baptism are so clearly defined in the commission, that there was no necessity to particularise them in any one instance. We generally find, wherever belief or baptsm is mentioned, that there is something expressed which gives a correct idea who and what the individuals were of whom it is said they believed or were baptized. For example, in Acts iv. 4, it is said five thousand believed; it does not say they were baptized, yet all who are familiar with the Will are assured that they were; for "the multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul."† Now although the historian, seeing that the administration of the ordinance on the day of Pentecost had been so lately witnessed, thought it unnecessary to say that they were baptized, yet he must have had sufficient reason for saying that the five thousand were men. Here,

* Page 421. † Acts iv. 32.

gentlemen, it is shown that there were no young people of any age, nor any women among them. Equally good reason had he for stating that those which resorted 'to the river side' were all women, and if Lydia had had even children there, they must have attained a state of womanhood. To guard the unwary, therefore, against the cavils of man, the qualifications of the individuals, or those things which constituted them fit subjects for baptism, are again specified, in four out of the five cases which have just been before us. Surely then the sacred historian would not have deemed it necessary to mention so particularly the opening of Lydia's heart, previous to her being baptized, if those whose hearts still remained closed to the truth could be partakers of the same privileges with her. According to these Witnesses, if their statements mean anything, those children and servants who are fortunate in having believing parents and masters, are in some occult manner saved through their instrumentality. But every believer in Christ knows to a certainty that those only who are drawn of the Father,* are fit subjects of baptism, and consequently of salvation.

That the term house, or household, in scripture, does not "properly denote" a man's children, or offspring, I have already proved; I have shewn also that the baptism of families is not a fact in accordance with the ancient practice of the circumcision of families. This was of force, that of free-will. Besides, under the old dispensation, males only could be circumcised; under the new, both males and females are baptized. Yet neither males nor females are commanded to be baptized in infancy: and until our opponents can show from the Word of God one single instance of a parent and a child of any age being baptized together, or of one being baptized because the other was, we must reject altogether the doctrine of infant baptism.

The Sixth Witness has said, "Although there is abundant evidence of the change of the rite, there is none whatever of any such change in its administration as excludes children from being any longer the legitimate subjects of its administration." Why does he then christen females? By no passage in the Will can he prove that they were by any outward rite made members of the Jewish community. If, as he now endeavours to show, in contradiction to his own previous assertion, "the covenant made with Abraham is the gospel covenant, under which we live, and which is the basis of

* John vi. 44.

the New Testament church; and the ordinance of circumcision was attached to that covenant as the sign of its blessing and the seal of its promise," why, if there be only a change in the rite, does he vary the subjects of its administration, and why does he not christen all the males of his own community? Neglecting this, he neglects the most essential part of the command, the only part on which an anathema was pronounced, and, by his own account, leaves the largest portion of them under the curse. Nay more, he leaves in jeopardy some of his christened ones too; for I presume he does not christen them all according to the covenant made with Abraham, *i. e.*, on the eighth day, which was of special importance. Still further; he christens a female child, for which that covenant gives him no authority, and leaves unchristened the servants of the house, who by that covenant were commanded to be circumcised. In short, gentlemen, his evidence is neither in accordance with the law nor the gospel; and if it serve to delude his followers, I feel assured it will not deceive an enlightened jury.

If it were a matter of course, as he asserts, that all the family were made meet for baptism through the faith of its head, I see not the necessity for the sacred writers to repeat, on four different occasions, that all the family believed. Doubtless, gentlemen, the record is thus particular, in order to warn the unlearned, that they might not be deluded by the sophistry of men; that they might not, through their teaching, be led to believe that the word *house*, or *household*, denotes young children. The angel said to Cornelius, Simon "shall tell thee words whereby thou and ALL thy house shall be saved."* "And the Holy Ghost fell on ALL them which heard the word....And he (Simon) commanded them to be baptized."† And those which heard the word were not the children of Cornelius, but "his kinsmen and near friends."‡ This then, gentlemen, makes it undeniably clear that there is but one way, one one truth, one life;§ "one Lord, one faith, one baptism;"‖ and that the four other families consisted of adults, and were baptized after the same manner, in accordance with the Saviour's express declaration, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." This declaration some of the Witnesses have not even noticed; the Sixth is one of them; and the reason of their silence is obvious—it presents an obstacle to their manner of teaching which not one of them can overcome.

* Acts xi. 14. † Acts x. 44—48.
‡ Acts x. 24. § John xiv. 6. ‖ Eph. iv. 5.

Families without children, gentlemen, as yourselves and every one in the Court know, are so common as scarcely to excite a remark. And until our opponents adduce irrefragable evidence that the households in question were not composed of kindred, friends, or domestics, but of children, some in an infantile state,—and show, too, that the children were baptized,—their statements are so contradictory and incongruous as to be utterly unworthy of credit.

Here I will put a question to this Witness; Provided a parent, some of whose family were reprobates, (I am far from insinuating that bad children militate against a parent's character,)—say, one of his own congregation, whom he knows well, and is satisfied with, but who had never been christened,—I say, suppose such an one proposed himself for a member of his community, would he christen him, and all his family with him, on the ground of his proposal? This course would be in accordance with the Abrahamic covenant, and his assenting would clearly prove his sincerity when he said that he believed the baptism of families "was a matter of course." But his refusal,—and I incline to the opinion that he would refuse,—would show, that while he argued one way, he acted in another. But let us hear his answer, gentlemen; we have a right to require it of him, as we have it from his own lips that he likes "honesty, not only as the best policy, but in all cases as most in harmony with right principle, and with satisfactory and comfortable feeling in one's own mind." Besides, gentlemen, it would not be the first "awkward thing" he has had to do.*

The Seventh Witness chimes in with his fellow, the Sixth, saying that the baptism of families was nothing new. "They were not singular cases, nor rare cases, nor cases not to be accounted for and justified by any peculiarity of circumstances, such as had not happened before, and might not soon happen again." Now, gentlemen, I shall show you the incorrectness of their conclusions, by proving that these baptisms *were* extraordinary occurrences, and not "matters of course."

The book of the Acts of the Apostles gives a very brief history of what took place in the going forth of the gospel, during the period of time which it embraces. In selecting the events that are noticed in it, the Holy Spirit directed the writer of them to those which are most illustrative of the power of God giving success to his word; and a careful perusal of the whole of the 16th chapter will satisfy any unprejudiced mind that the conversion of both the households

* See his Lecture on Voluntary Church Controversy, page 1.

was as much an extraordinary occurrence as that of the conversion of Lydia or the jailer; both were the effect of an extraordinary interposition of the Most High God. The mission of the apostles into Macedonia, whither they were called from Troas, across the Ægean Sea, to preach the gospel to them, was altogether special and extraordinary. Now, gentlemen, if we take the whole into our view, cause and effect, it is clear that the Almighty designed us to regard these exercises of his power as extraordinary, purposely displayed to produce an extraordinary effect. It would be thought, even now, by those who know the truth, a very uncommon occurrence for a whole household to be converted, and to become at the same instant followers of Christ. And such is each of the four cases we have already considered, with the one now before us, as I shall proceed to show.

An angel of the Lord appeared to Cornelius saying, "Send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon... he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." Peter fell into a trance, and it was shown him by a vision from heaven that all national distinctions should cease; that the Gentiles were to enjoy the same privileges as the Jews; and he was exhorted not to call that common which God had cleansed. Peter returned with the men whom Cornelius had sent, and the Holy Spirit, to give him a still further assurance that the Heathens were to be brought into the same fold as the Jews, fell upon them while Peter was yet speaking, and they all spake with tongues and magnified God. And yet, gentlemen, this case,—which is one of the only two cases on record in which any individual was baptized with the Holy Ghost previous to being baptized in water, not excepting that glorious Being, "the only-begotten of the Father,"—which is the most extraordinary case that is related in the Acts!—which stands alone, none similar to it having happened before, and, the glorious purpose for which it was revealed being established, which shall never happen again,—this case, I say, thus distinguished, has in it, according to this Witness, nothing extraordinary!

In the case of the jailer we have another extraordinary manifestation of Divine power, in confirmation of the Divine mission of the apostles. The foundations of the prison were shaken by an earthquake, all the doors were opened, and every one's bands were loosed; and yet,—and this is not the least part of the miracle,—not a prisoner escaped! Still, according to these Witnesses, this was not a

singular case—nor a rare case—only a matter of course! It is evident that the miracle was not performed for the purpose of liberating Paul and Silas, for they did not take advantage of it; nor for the salvation of the jailer only, but for the salvation of ALL his house; and for a further confirmation that Paul and Silas were ministers of the true God, and that the messages they brought were dictated by the Holy Spirit. We have no account of such a circumstance having happened before, and it is certain the like can never happen again: the mission of the apostles being established, miracles have for ever ceased.

The only particulars given of the conversion of Stephanas and his household are, that they were the first-fruits of Achaia, who became all teachers and labourers with Paul. This, then, must be regarded as a singular circumstance; not only were they all converted, but all became chosen ministers of Christ.

"And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord with all his house." This also is a singular and very rare case. At one time during the Testator's ministry, the pharisees enquired, by way of derision and triumph, "Have any of the rulers believed on him?" Here we have an instance of a *chief* ruler, not only believing, but confessing his belief in baptism, in which he was joined by all his house.

There is something very striking in the manner in which the case of Lydia is recorded; for although we know that all believers are taught of the Lord, yet Lydia is the only one of whom it is expressly said, that he opened her heart. We have a right to presume, nay, to be certain, from the preceding cases, that Paul had sufficient evidence that the members of her household were under the same influence as herself.

I have thus proved to you, gentlemen, that the calling of the households of Cornelius, of Lydia, of the jailer, of Crispus, and of Stephanas, was extraordinary, and not a "matter of course;" a mode of speaking of the divine procedure, which, if not profane, is certainly very indecorous. The ground these Witnesses have taken, therefore, is dangerous, and it would be well for them to move off it as quickly as possible, lest, when it is too late, it should prove like that upon which stood Korah, Dathan, and Abiram.

This Witness is certain that Lydia was the only believer of her family, because she said, "If ye have judged *me* to be faithful to the Lord, come into *my* house, and abide;" as if servants, when

they became believers, altered their relative character as such.* His certainty depends upon a simple and familiar mode of expression, every day used, and which cannot without violence be construed to signify anything of an exclusive meaning. Here, gentlemen, we have an instance of the subterfuges to which our opponents are reduced, when, in support of their tottering cause, they have recourse to a text which gives them no support. Unless they are prepared to assert that Lydia was the only one of the family arrived at an age capable of believing, then unbelieving adults must have been baptized; and repentance and faith previous to baptism, on which our opponents, notwithstanding their laxity in such cases, insist, the apostles must in this instance have dispensed with. But, gentlemen, this Witness is not master of his subject; he should have studied it better. Paul had preached and baptized "from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum;" and it is very easy to conceive how difficult it would have been for him to remember every individual that he had baptized. But this is no excuse for this Witness being ignorant of the baptism of Crispus and his house, which was one of the only five houses mentioned.

He further told you, gentlemen,—and in this instance told you truly,—that there is but one baptism in the church of God; and that from first to last, in scripture history, there is no doubt but it was administered in one way. This is the very fact which we are defending. But you have had ample evidence that, upon this fact particularly, the Witnesses are not only opposed to each other, but that each is opposed to himself. For they admit of three modes of baptizing, by sprinkling, pouring, and immersion, and are unable to decide which is the true one. And they have yet to prove, that either John, or the Testator, or the apostles, or any of the disciples, ever baptized an individual incapable of making a profession. I will here, gentlemen, put a question to this Witness, and wait his answer.

Counsel.—Do you believe that the act of popping a handful of water on the face, or into the mouth, of an infant born of (what you call) a believer, can, either at the time or afterwards, be of any service to it?

Witness.—"Unless the children even of believing parents shall come, in the event of their arriving at years capable of it, to embrace the faith of Christ themselves, they have no privilege of their own;

* See 1 Tim. vi. 1, 2.

for in no case can men become sons of God from carnal descent."* Behold, gentlemen, the fruition of christening infants!

The First Witness came, in a very few words, to a correct conclusion. He said that "Lydia attended to the things spoken by Paul; that she believed them as the doctrines of God; that in this faith she was joined by her whole family, and that in it they were baptized."

The Second Witness said, and truly, "The opening of the heart to receive Jesus Christ, is the peculiar effect of the grace of God." Seeing then, gentlemen, that what gave her a right to baptism could only be communicated by omnipotent power, it is impossible that she could communicate it to her household, let them have been either children or servants. Yet he told you that all her family, *upon her undertaking* to bring them up in the knowledge of Christ, were admitted to the ordinance with her. Believers are admonished to bring their children up "in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;"† but to give them a saving knowledge of Christ is the prerogative of God, which this Witness admits; and nothing less than that knowledge can make them fit subjects for baptism. The baptism of Lydia's household is a leading precedent, or excuse, for making people believe that their children are made heirs of God by sponsors undertaking to believe for them, or by parents solemnly dedicating them to him. "Woe to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, that take counsel, but not of me, and that cover with a covering, but not of my Spirit, that they may add sin to sin."‡ "As their fathers did, so do they." Observe, gentlemen, the fatal effect of prejudice. This Witness, because he was taught in his early days that a child might believe by proxy, still believes it; and instead of studying the scriptures with the simplicity of a child, he and his brethren, the other Witnesses, study them to see how far they can be strained to correspond with their preconceived opinions.

The Fourth Witness said, that "Lydia was led to embrace the gospel, and was baptized with her household, the adult part of which no doubt were instructed in christianity along with her; and also that there is no proof that there were any children in her family." Surely then, gentlemen, you will coincide with me in thinking that the evidence of this Witness modestly conveys his opinion that Lydia had no young children, but that her household, of whatever

* Page 229. † Eph. vi. 4. ‡ Isaiah xxx. 1.

description it might have been, had had their hearts opened, as she had had, previous to being baptized.

"Not to mention Stephanas and the jailer," said the Eighth Witness; and why not mention them? Because, gentlemen, he had previously asserted that the jailer's whole family were *all* taught and converted, and therefore, had he mentioned him, he would have been constrained to state in what respect Lydia's household differed from the jailer's, that her's only should be baptized previously to their being converted.

The Ninth Witness, after an arduous but fruitless attempt to prove that there were unbelievers in one or other of the houses, turns round, and informs you that there is a circumstance strongly confirmatory of the probability that the house of Lydia, according to the natural import of the word rendered house or family, contained children, and that in an infantile state. That is, that in all, — mark, gentlemen, IN ALL, — the other instances in which adults are mentioned as having been baptized along with the head of the family, they are mentioned as "hearing" and "believing;" or terms are used to imply this. Thus he gets himself into a labyrinth. He acknowledges the apostles did not baptize the servants belonging to these houses, without first having had evidence of their faith; but he implies that they did baptize their infant children. This, gentlemen, cannot be, when it is positively stated in the Will that ALL the house of Crispus and Cornelius were baptized in faith, as well as the jailer and all his. The circumstance he mentions weakens, instead of confirming, the probability that the house of Lydia contained infants. For why should Lydia's house differ from the others, especially as her case is mentioned in a similar manner? The Lord opened Lydia's heart, and she was baptized, and her household. The jailer said, What must I do to be saved? Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, was the reply, and thou shalt be saved, and thine house. The expressions are in effect the same, and yet he waives the point of the jailer having had children. And after all his argument respecting Lydia's house, the only conclusion that he arrives at is, that it is *strongly confirmatory of a probability* that it contained infants. Gentlemen, this lame conclusion affords evident proof that he himself has no confidence in the validity of his own reasoning; and to you, who require incontestable demonstration, it is literally worthless.

We are not, gentlemen, as the Ninth Witness has observed,

obliged to assume that there were no children in these houses. We assert, boldly, and have scriptural authority for doing so, that there were no individuals in any of them incapable of being taught "to observe all things" commanded by the Testator. No, no, gentlemen; it is these Witnesses who, lacking such authority, are obliged to assume the contrary.

Our opponents, gentlemen, I think will admit, that there cannot be, under the gospel, one law for one house, and another for another house, any more than that there was, under the old dispensation, more than one way by which any one could be numbered among the ancient people of God. This is stated in Exodus xii. 48, 49. "When a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover,...let all his males be circumcised, and then let him come near and keep it; and he shall be as one that is born in the land, for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof. One law shall be to him that is home-born, and unto the stranger that sojourneth among you." So, likewise, there is only one law under the new dispensation, by which any individual can be numbered among the saints of God, and be privileged to eat at the table of his Son; and that is, "believing in the Lord Jesus Christ," and publicly confessing his name in baptism — that ordinance which he himself has commanded. "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

If one thing can demonstrate more clearly than another the nakedness of the Plaintiff's cause, that thing, gentlemen, is their wresting the scriptures. How insidiously the Ninth Witness introduced the word "therefore," in order to make the text read as follows: "The Lord opened Lydia's heart, that she attended to the things that were spoken by Paul; she was *therefore* baptized, and her house." From this house, said he, no one has authority to exclude children. But what authority has he given you for including them? Again, he said the words relative to the jailer are more properly rendered, "and he, believing in God, rejoiced with all his house." Yet, gentlemen, he made a poor figure in the box, when, unable to prove that the jailer had children, he ignobly conceded the question, by saying, "This is not the only believing family mentioned, from which infants must be excluded." Here he says, Lydia's family were baptized with her, according to the *common custom* of the Jews; by which he would have you believe that that common custom was a positive fact; while before, he spoke hesi-

tatingly upon it, saying, *We have every reason to believe* that the admission of proselytes was marked by a washing.

I have before pointed out to you, gentlemen, that neither he nor any one else has authority from the Will to assert that the Jews baptized the children of proselyted Gentiles. But even if they had baptized them, it could only have been by adding to the institutions of God, as the Plaintiffs are now doing. While for any one to assert that the Lord of life and glory adopted the ordinance of baptism from the supererogatory practice of his disobedient people, is to contradict his word, which declared that it was "from heaven."

None of the Witnesses ventured an opinion as to whether Lydia had a husband, or any of the four men wives, except the Ninth, and he only incidentally, in the case of Stephanas. Now, gentlemen, is it not natural to presume, that if these Witnesses had come here to bear an honest testimony relative to the forementioned case, they would have said no more than "that instances may be found where the word house, or household, may include children; but as we have no means of ascertaining that either Cornelius, the jailer, Lydia, Crispus, or Stephanas were ever married, we cannot say if they had children at all, much more children in an infantile state." So saying, they would have shown themselves upright men, and you would have listened to them as such. It is vain to argue the point, that there either were or were not females in any of the four families mentioned; but as I am allowed to give an opinion, I think there were none, because there is not the most distant allusion to any.

The Levitical law made a difference between males and females. There was no initiatory ordinance for the latter. The animals offered for sacrifice consisted principally of males. Male children were circumcised, and all the first-born of them were set apart unto the Lord. And it is said, "When a man shall make a singular vow, the persons shall be for the Lord by thy estimation, and thy estimation shall be of the male, from twenty years old... fifty shekels of silver. And if it be a female, then thy estimation shall be thirty shekels. And if it be five years old... then thy estimation shall be, of the male twenty shekels, and for the female ten shekels."* Now if the four houses had contained no women,—which might have been the case, for we know of a certainty that three of the family of Cornelius were males; and besides, it is said that it was "his kins*men* and near friends" that were in his company when Peter came to him;

* Lev. xxvii. 2—5.

then the people might have imagined, if there had been no instances of the baptism of female households, that a distinction in sex still remained. But this was not the case; for Paul, writing to the Galatians, says, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ; there is neither...male nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."* As a proof of this, we have Lydia and her household, and the men and their households, mentioned in terms of nearly the same import. Paul writes, "On the Sabbath-day, we went out of the city, by a river side, where prayer was wont to be made, and we sat down and spake to the *women* which resorted thither;" plainly intimating that there were no men in the company, besides himself and his companions. From the concise and simple narrative of the transaction it appears, not only that Lydia and her household were there and then baptized, but that her household consisted of females, who were at that time called of God from among the women who resorted to the river side. Nor let it be supposed that the case of Lydia's household was an isolated case, or one that differed from the others; because faith and baptism were inseparably connected, the former, with two exceptions, universally preceded the latter, and must precede it, until the Lord himself shall descend from heaven.† The plain dictates of the Will forbid the supposition that Paul would have baptized Lydia's household, in the absence of the same proof of their faith which she had furnished; and this example, like the others, is doubtless recorded for the purpose of showing that no individual whatever can be scripturally baptized until after he is taught of the Lord. John wrote "to the elect lady and her children," and said, "I rejoiced greatly that I found of thy children walking in truth."‡ We may safely conclude, then, that as John particularly mentions the children of this one family, Paul and Peter would not have been silent upon the fact, if there had been children in any of the five.

Now, gentlemen, notwithstanding we have been told that the arguments founded upon the baptism of these households are only auxiliary ones, of very inferior importance to those which have gone before, I think you are pretty well convinced that they are entirely without foundation. These words, house and household, are the very foundation-stones on which our opponents erect the doctrine of infant christening; and yet the words child or children are never

* Gal. iii. 26. 28. † 1 Thess. iv. 16. ‡ 2 John 4.

once mentioned in any of them. Besides which, I have cited many instances to shew, that wherever children composed a part of the house, they were particularly mentioned; they are so mentioned, even in the passages quoted by the Ninth Witness.

It is strange indeed, gentlemen, that the Plaintiffs will continue to hazard their eternal salvation on evidence so incongruous and inconclusive as that which you have just heard—evidence which I have proved from the Will to be unscriptural, and which, in fact, has been overturned by one or other of their own Witnesses. The greater part of the evidence, indeed, is opposed to the address of their own Counsel. He wishes the baptism of Lydia and her household to be compared with the baptism of the jailer and all his; and boldly asserts, without any the least equivocation, that the household of the latter makes a conspicuous figure in the narrative, because it is specified, with a degree of minuteness, that he and all his house believed, and that he and all his were baptized straightway. Now from the certainty of the jailer's house being baptized in faith, he argues for the uncertainty of that of Lydia's being so baptized, and this, merely because it is not so circumstantially stated, for which reason he supposes the *two cases are not alike.* To help out his supposition, he thinks the following futile observation "is not unworthy of remark, that Lydia's *trade was mean*, and could neither *require nor support* even a *few* servants." After all his arguing, however, he tacitly admits that he may be mistaken, even in the case of Lydia's household; and that if he is, the New Testament *is without an instance* of infant baptism.

Nor is it less strange, that while the different pedobaptist bodies of Great Britain number among them multitudes of men of the greatest attainments, who, in all earthly studies, profit by reflection and experience, and, guided by their own judgment of facts, never rest satisfied so long as there is scope to obtain more perfect knowledge in the particular object of their pursuit, should, nevertheless, with respect to the majority of them, and on a subject before which all earthly knowledge is counted by God as "less than nothing and vanity,"* remain during their whole lives in an apathetic and stationary state, resigning their judgment to others, and resting quietly and contentedly "on the good words and fair speeches" of such men as the Plaintiff's Counsel and Witnesses—men who, in *the knowledge of Christ*, have only the name of being

* Isaiah xl. 17.

learned, and who might tremble to be "weighed in the balances." Some individuals have observed, how little sense is required in governing a nation; here you have positive demonstration how little is thought requisite to instruct one, and that in its most momentous concern,—the eternal well-being of its inhabitants.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON MATT. XVIII. 2—6.

"And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me. But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea."

The First Witness said, "Unless ye be saved from those prejudices which are at present so baneful to your nation, [seeking a temporal and not a spiritual kingdom,] unless ye be clothed with the spirit of humility, ye cannot enter into the spirit, design, and privileges of my spiritual and eternal kingdom....Be as truly without worldly ambition and the lust of power as little children are, who act among themselves as if all were equal. So great is the disparity between the kingdom of Christ and the kingdoms of this world, that there is no way of rising to honours in the former, but by humility of mind and continual self-abasement. Thus our Lord shows them that they were all *equal*, and that there could be no superiority among them, but what must come from the deepest humility. He intimates also that wherever this principle should be found, it would save its possessor from seeking worldly honours, or earthly profits, and from seeking to be a *ruler* over his brethren, or a lord in God's

heritage. As our Lord considers a little child an emblem of a genuine disciple, so by the term 'one such little child,' he means a *disciple* only. Whosoever will receive, *i. e.*, show unto such a child-like, unambitious disciple of mine any act of kindness, for my sake, I will consider it as done to myself. But, on the contrary, 'whosoever shall offend one of these little ones,'—whosoever shall cause one of the least of those who believe in me to be stumbled, to go into the spirit of the world, or give way to sin, such an one shall meet with the most exemplary punishment.*

"'There were brought to him little children, that he should put his hands on them and pray; and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven,'† or *the kingdom of heaven is composed of such*. This appears to be the best sense of the passage, and utterly ruins the whole inhuman, diabolical system of what is called non-elect infants' damnation,—a doctrine which must have sprung from Moloch, and can only be defended by a heart in which he dwells. A great part of God's kingdom is composed of such *literally*, and those only who resemble little children shall be received into it."‡

The Second Witness said, "Our Saviour, intending to cure this pride and ambition in his disciples, first preaches to them the doctrine of humility; and to enforce his doctrine, he sets before them *a little child*, the poor emblem of humility, assuring them that unless they be converted, and turn from the sin of pride and ambition, and become as a little child in lowliness of mind and contempt of worldly greatness, they cannot be saved.§...

"In Luke xviii. 15—17, and Mark x. 15, it is said, 'They brought young children to him that he should touch them.' But for what end? Not to baptize them, but to bless them,‖—that 'they should be preserved from bodily diseases, and from Satan's power; that he would confer on them all needful blessings.' We learn that infants are capable of benefit by Jesus Christ; that it is the best office parents can perform unto their children, to bring them unto Christ, that they may be made partakers of that benefit. That if 'infants are capable of benefit by Christ,' if capable of blessings on earth, and presence in heaven, if they be subjects of his kingdom of grace, and

* Matt. xviii. 2—6. † Matt. xix. 13, 14. ‡ Matt. xix. 14.
§ Page 64. ‖ Page 143.

heirs of his kingdom of glory, then may they be baptized, for they that are within the covenant* have a right to the privilege of the covenant, and to baptism, the seal of the covenant; and if Christ denies not infants the kingdom of heaven, which is the greater, what reason have his ministers to deny them the benefit of baptism, which is the less? That Christ will have all his disciples and followers to resemble little children in such properties wherein they may be patterns to them, *i. e.*, in humility and innocence, in freedom from malice and revenge, in docility and teachableness, in cleaving to and depending upon their parents, and in contentedness with their condition. 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, shall in no wise enter therein.'"†

Cross-examined.—"Christ‡ acquaints Nicodemus, and in him all persons, that there must be a change from nature to grace, before there can be a change from grace to glory ... and assures him that nothing short of a regenerating change would bring him to heaven."§

The THIRD WITNESS said, "'Except ye be converted, and become as little children,' &c. Such was our Saviour's warning to the unbelieving Jews; and it was a warning highly necessary to be impressed, not upon them alone, but upon men of every description to whom the gospel was originally preached. The gospel militated against the prejudices, the pride, and the corrupt passions of all men; nor unless they were subdued and superseded by humility, docility, modesty, simplicity, and that comparative innocence which are the most distinguishing qualities of childhood, could it be effectually received." So also, "universally, both among Jews and among Gentiles, those who were living under the dominion of sin, or were not duly convinced of the necessity of a Redeemer; every man who was subject to prepossessions such as these, (and they comprise almost every sort of man that breathes,) must have been converted from his errors, whether in principle or in practice; his heart must have been opened, and softened, and rendered capable of receiving fresh and totally different impressions, before he could become a believer in the truth, or a performer of the duties of the gospel.

"Every man who now also is under the influence of similar prepossessions, must now also undergo a similar change. Every unbeliever and every sinner, although made by baptism a member of Christ, and a child of God, must be, in a certain sense, converted,

* Acts ii. 39. † Page 247. ‡ John iii. 3. § Page 280.

if he would ultimately succeed to his inheritance of the kingdom of heaven. But to fancy that every christian whatever must experience a conversion, in order to be in a state of salvation; to assert, with the Arminian founder of Methodism,* that 'he who knows no time when he had need of such a vast and mighty change as a change from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God, from death unto life, may by this also know, if he give himself leave to think, that he is not born of the Spirit, that he has never yet known God, but has mistaken the voice of nature for the voice of God:' to suppose, with his Calvinistic competitor† 'that in every christian congregation there are two sorts of people, some that know Christ, and some that do not know him, some that are converted, and some that are strangers to conversion;' and to assert 'that every person must be converted or be damned, and that they who die in an unconverted state must be damned for ever:' to contend, as is stated to be the opinion of our self-denominated evangelical brethren, by their apologist,‡ that 'in order to a state of salvation, a change of mind, of views, and dispositions must be effected *in every person*, wherever born, however educated, or of whatever external conduct;' this is a conceit which revelation warrants not, and which reason and experience disclaim.

"That no man, however near he may approach to the perfection of the christian character, and however lowly an example he may exhibit of the beauty of holiness, is absolutely perfect and free from the dominion of sin, I readily admit. Every man has been undoubtedly guilty of 'sins, negligences, and ignorances,' for which he will be brought to account, and will need the atoning blood of the Redeemer. But some humble christians also undoubtedly there are, who, having been once regenerated by water and the Holy Spirit, have so followed his heavenly motions, and improved his sanctifying graces; have so pursued the calm and blameless tenor of their way; have preserved that child-like simplicity of character, and that child-like innocence of conduct, that their angels may not blush to behold the face of their heavenly Father....

"And are we to be told that christians such as these must experience an entire change of heart, a thorough conversion of their ways? It is not to ascribe any merit to their righteousness; it is no prejudice to the precious efficacy of the Redeemer's blood, or to the all-sufficiency of the Holy Spirit, to say that they need no con-

* Wesley. † Whitefield. ‡ Overton.

version. By that blood they have been purified from the original corruption of their nature; by that blood they have been cleansed of their actual sins; by the Holy Spirit of God they have been regenerated; his preventing grace hath conducted them, his assisting grace hath co-operated with, and given effect to, their zealous endeavours to persevere in the course of piety and virtue; his sanctifying influence renews and invigorates them day by day. Let God have all the glory of their continuance in their christian career, but let it not be judged necessary that they should undergo 'a change of mind, of views, and dispositions,' when that change must be from holiness unto sin; let them not be subject to a conversion which must be the very reverse of turning them from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God." *

The Fourth Witness said, "The expression 'of such is the kingdom of heaven,' seems to mean that little children are admissible into the visible church, under the New Testament dispensation, as they had been under that of Moses. Christ did not indeed order their infants to be baptized, for christian baptism was not then explicitly instituted as the initiatory ordinance, and circumcision was still in force. Yet the passage seems to give considerable sanction to that method of bringing children to Christ, that they may be admitted among the subjects of his visible kingdom; and we must think those disciples at present mistaken who object to it, sometimes with arguments which would have equally held good against infant circumcision, or against 'bringing infants to Christ that he might touch them.' Indeed, the expression may also intimate that the kingdom of *heavenly glory* is greatly constituted of such as die in their infancy. Infants are as capable of regeneration as grown persons; and there is ground to conclude that all those who have not lived to commit actual transgressions, though they share in the effects of the first Adam's offence, will also share in the blessings of the second Adam's gracious covenant, without their personal faith and obedience, but not without the regenerating influence of the Spirit of Christ.†

"The language in this gospel (Mark) is more emphatical than that of St. Matthew, and it must be obvious that the exhortations and instructions which might have been addressed both to the parents and the children, and by the parents to their children, as a

* Pages 58—63. † Matt. xix. 13—15.

subsequent improvement of the transaction, must have been in many respects similar to those which may be grounded on infant baptism, when duly improved. The passage, therefore, though not a direct proof, has surely a favourable aspect towards bringing our infant offspring to Christ, seeking his blessing on them, and devoting them to his service in this sacrament, provided it be done intelligently and uprightly. 'He took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.' What christian parent does not beseech him thus to embrace his children in the arms of his mercy, and to lay his hands upon them and bless them? And is not this the language of parents in presenting their children for baptism, if rightly understood and attended to."*

The FIFTH WITNESS said, "It is here to be remembered, that as religious education is constituted in the Christian Church a primary mean of salvation, so the ordinance of baptism is invested with a peculiar importance, from the intimate and acknowledged connexion between the act of devoting a child to God in this manner, and the duty of educating him for the service of his Maker, and the attainment of eternal life....

"When children die in infancy, and are scripturally dedicated to God in baptism, there is much and very consoling reason furnished to believe that they are accepted beyond the grave....

"When little children were brought to our Saviour, he said, 'Suffer the little children,' &c. This seems to be a plain declaration that children are admitted to this kingdom, and constitute not a small part of the persons of whom it is composed. 'The *promise*,' said *St. Peter*, to the *Jews*, '*is to you and your children*.' If this promise is extended. in any sense, to those who die in infancy, and conveys to them any blessings, they must be found beyond the grave....

"Children to whom this ordinance has been dispensed, are by these means doubly assured of the certain and inestimable benefits of religious education, and are entitled, in a peculiar manner, to the counsel, the reproof, the conversation, the example, and the prayers of christians.†...

"A serious observer is, perhaps, hardly ever a witness of the administration of this ordinance, without strongly realising the existence of that moral pollution which is symbolically washed away by baptism. The baptism of infants, particularly, exhibits this subject

* Mark x. 15. 16. † Vol. 2, page 519.

in the strongest light. Here we see that our race, in the view of their Creator, indispensably need the cleansing which is accomplished by the blood of Christ, and the renewing power of the Holy Ghost, antecedently to their possible commission of sin by voluntary acts. Their original corruption is, therefore, taught by this ordinance in language which cannot be misconstrued, and is impressed upon us with singular force by its solemn and significant symbols.*...

"As there is no limitation of the promise made here by Peter, (Acts ii. 38, 39,) when he said, 'The promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call,' nor in any other part of the New Testament: we have, in this fact, ample proof that it is extended to Christians without any limitation. It may, I think, be safely concluded, that if so great a change had been made in the conditions of the promise, St. Peter would, at this very time, have advertised these Jews of such a change. We may, at least, be certain, that he or some other apostle would have announced this change somewhere. But no such annunciation exists in the New Testament. The change, therefore, has not been made; and children hold exactly the same relation to the church at the present time which they held under the Abrahamic dispensation. ... The only appointed way in which children may be offered to God is baptism; the children of believing parents are therefore to be offered to God in *baptism*.†...

"The persons addressed by St. Peter (Acts ii. 38, 39,) were a collection of Jews. Of course they were persons on whom God had placed his covenant, and to whom he had affixed the seal of circumcision. They were persons who had regularly partaken of the Passover through life. They were not excommunicated persons. They were therefore still in the covenant. On this ground St. Peter declares to them, that the promise was still to them, and to their children."‡

Cross-examined.—"There is, I think, reason to hope well concerning other children [those which are unchristened] dying in infancy; but there is certainly peculiar reason for christian parents to entertain strong consolation with respect to their offspring, whom God has not only permitted, but required them, to offer up to him in this ordinance, pointing so extensively and so significantly to their purification.§...

* Page 520.
† Vol. ii. page 536.
‡ Vol. ii. page 537.
§ Vol. ii. page 519.

"There is but too much reason to believe, that not only the persons, particularly the children who have been baptized, but the parents also, are in many instances lamentably ignorant of the nature of this institution, the truths which it declares, the duties which it involves, and the privileges which it confers."*

The Sixth Witness said, "'And they brought young children,' &c.†...Of this kingdom young children (infants) are here most explicitly declared to be subjects; partakers of its privileges and blessings. If, as some allege, the phrase 'of such' means of *persons possessing the dispositions of children*, it means this, beyond all question, inclusively of the children themselves. If not, the reason for receiving them would have been as applicable to lambs or doves as to children: besides that the words which follow ascertain their being included, 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God *as a little child*,' (*i. e.*, surely as a little child *receives it*,) he shall in no case enter therein.' The Sovereign of this kingdom, then, distinctly recognises little children among his subjects."...Let the court "recollect, then, the previous state of things, and let me ask it, Is this at all like the language of *exclusion?*...The persons by whom these children were brought to Jesus, professed, in the very act of bringing them, their faith in him, and the value they set on his blessing.‡...

"Infant baptism contains a constant memorial of *original* sin; of the *corruption* of our *nature* being not merely contracted, but *inherent*. Every time it is administered to an infant, it emblematically reminds all who witness it of the truth expressed by the psalmist, 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.' And this doctrine of original corruption, of which infant baptism is a standing practical recognition, is one of fundamental importance; one that, I am satisfied, to inadequate conceptions and impressions of which, may be traced all the principal perversions of the gospel... It teaches, very simply but very significantly, that even from the womb children are the subjects of pollution, and that they stand in need of a participation in the pardon of the original apostacy, and of purification from the inherent depravity of their nature, in order to their entering heaven and seeing God."§

I shall now, gentlemen, "request your attention to Acts ii. 38, 39, 'Repent, and be baptized,...for the promise is to you and to

* Vol. ii. page 521.
† Mark x. 13—16.
‡ Pages 121—123.
§ Pages 179, 180.

your children,' &c. These words were addressed by a Jew to fellow Jews. How would such an audience understand them? When they heard of a promise *to them and to their children*, could their minds fail, on such an occasion, to go back to the promise of the covenant made with their fathers, and declared to be to them and to their seed after them? And in that case there was but one sense in which the hearers of Peter could understand the designation 'your children.'...And if they did so understand them, they must have conceived of them as assuming and intimating the continuance of the same connexion. Are we then to suppose that this holy man of God, speaking as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, would, without explanation or restriction, at the 'very beginning of the gospel,' in his first address to his countrymen, when a right impression was of so much consequence, employ expressions that were fitted to convey to their minds a false and worldly view of the nature of the Messiah's kingdom?"*...

Cross-examined.—"Far be it from us to deny, that infants may be acknowledged to be of the kingdom of God without baptizing them. Far be it from us to pass any such sentence of exclusion against the children of our baptist brethren, however much we may think their parents mistaken. We do not consider the outward rite as thus essential to salvation. But this we say, that if infants are capable subjects of the kingdom, and are pronounced such by the Lord himself, there is surely no contradiction or incongruity in infant baptism; that is, in the application of the *sign* to those who are admitted to be capable of the *thing signified*. There is certainly nothing in this that can warrant the scorn and ridicule with which it has been assailed."†

The Eighth Witness said, "When infants were once brought to our Saviour, to be made partakers of the blessings of his kingdom, he openly and severally *rebuked* his disciples, and was highly displeased with them, for endeavouring to hinder it. He kindly took them (infants) into his arms, laid his hands upon them, and blessed them; and commanded that little children should be suffered to come, *i. e.*, be brought to him, and not be forbidden, declaring that of such is the kingdom of God; *i. e.*, that these also have a place in the kingdom of the Messiah which was now to be set up, and a right to the blessings which himself, the promised King, was come to bestow.

* Pages 120, 123. † Page 182.

"At another time, he took a little child into his arms, and showing it to his disciples, said, 'Whosoever shall receive one such little child in my name receiveth me.' Now the receiving of a child in Christ's name must mean the considering or treating it as standing in some peculiar relation to Christ; as belonging to Christ; as being a subject of his kingdom, or a part of his flock. That this is what our Lord means, by 'receiving in his name,' himself has expressly shewn, by thus explaining it in this same discourse, 'because ye belong to Christ.'* 'Whoso shall give you a cup of water to drink in my name, because ye belong to Christ, verily I say unto you,' &c. Hence, then, it is most evident that infants may be, yea, are to be, received in Christ's name, and that by this we are to understand 'receiving them' as belonging, or standing in some peculiar relation to Christ; but in this peculiar relation to Christ, an infant can no otherwise stand than by being solemnly devoted to him, and admitted into his kingdom and church....

"It cannot be here said, that the words 'of such,' are to be understood not of infants in years, but of persons of a childlike and humble disposition. Because this would represent our Lord's conduct as extremely absurd. For why should he be very angry with his disciples for forbidding infants in years to be brought to him, because of grown persons of an humble disposition his kingdom consisted? There is no just connexion betwixt his great displeasure at them for keeping infants from him, and his giving as the reason of it, that to quite different subjects, meek and humble persons, his kingdom belonged. According to this interpretation, our Lord might rationally have done the same had lambs or doves been going to be presented to him; he might have been very angry with those who should have forbid them, and have said, 'Suffer them to be brought, for of such,' *i. e.* of persons of a meek and harmless temper, is 'the kingdom of God.'

"In the eye of the christian law, infants are actually under a sentence of condemnation, and considered as sinners, by being made to suffer death, the punishment and effect of sin, cannot be denied, 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all, for that' (...as far as which, or...through whom)...all are treated as if they 'had sinned.'† (Iniquity and sin are very frequently used in scripture, where not any real guilt or moral turpitude is meant, but only the effects or the punishment of

* Mark ix. 41. † Rom. v. 12.

sin. (See Gen. xix. 15, 1 Sam. xxviii. 10, 2 Kings vii. 9, Isa. liii. 6. 11, 12; 1 Peter ii. 24, 2 Cor. v. 21, Heb. ix. 28.) And this suggests an easy, and, doubtless, the *true* sense of that much controverted text, Ps. li. 5, 'I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me;' alluding to the *bitter* sorrows in which, in consequence of the first sin,* the woman is sentenced to conceive and to bring forth.) 'By one man's offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation.'† 'By one man's offence many were made sinners.'‡ 'In Adam all die.'§ Though infants are incapable of any *moral* or *proper* guilt, yet as, in the wise scheme of God's providence, they are at present subjected to innumerable pains, diseases, and death, the penal effects of sin through the disobedience of Adam, they are, agreeable to the style of scripture, said to *have sinned, and to be made, i. e.*, treated as *sinners.*

"Now, the same discourse of the apostle, which represents them as condemned and suffering through Adam, represents them also as justified and saved through Jesus Christ. 'For as by the offence of one (Adam) judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so, by the righteousness of one (Christ), the free gift came upon all men to justification of life; for as by the disobedience of one many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.'‖ As much as to say, the salutary effects of the second Adam's virtue are as extensive as the penal ones of the first Adam's sin. Or, as the malignity of that first offence reached even to infants, subjecting them to death, so the benefit of Christ's obedience reaches also to infants, justifying, absolving, and restoring them to life. It procures for, and gives to them, that 'spirit of life' which releases and sets them free from the 'law of sin and death.' Now, of God's giving, and of men's receiving, this life-giving spirit, the baptismal water is the appointed token, or emblem, in the church."¶

The Ninth Witness said, "We grant that this (Luke ix. 47, 48,) is an instance of teaching by parabolic action. The intention of Christ was to impress the necessity of humility and teachableness upon his disciples, and to afford a promise to those who should receive them in his name, of that special grace which was implied in receiving himself. But then, were there not a correspondence of

* Gen. iii. 16. † Verse 18. ‡ Verse 19.
§ 1 Cor. xv. 22. ‖ Rom. v. 18, 19 ¶ Pages 9—13.

circumstances between the child taken by Jesus in his arms, and the disciples compared to this child, there would be no force, no propriety, in the action; and the same truth might have been as forcibly stated without any action of this kind at all. Let, then, these correspondences be remarked, in order to estimate the amount of their meaning. The humility and docility of the true disciple correspond with the same disposition in a young child; and the 'receiving a disciple in *the name*' of Christ, corresponds with the receiving of a child in *the name* of Christ; which can only mean the receiving of each with kindness, on account of a *religious relation* between each and Christ, which religious relation can only be well interpreted of *a church relation*. This is further confirmed by the next point of correspondence, the *identity* of Christ both with the disciple and the child. 'Whosoever shall receive this child in my name, *receiveth me*.' But such an identity of Christ with his disciples stands wholly upon their relation to him as members of his mystical 'body, the church.' It is in this respect only that they are 'one with him;' and there can be no identity of Christ with 'little children,' but by virtue of the same relation; that is, as they are *members* of his mystical body, the church, *of which membership* baptism is now, as circumcision was then, the initiatory rite. That was the relation in which the very child he then took up in his arms stood to him, by virtue of its circumcision. It was a member of the Old Testament church; but as he was speaking of his disciples as the future teachers of his perfected covenant, and their reception in his name under that character, he manifestly glances at the church relationship of children to him, to be established by the baptism to be instituted in his perfect dispensation.*...

"The first evasive criticism of our opponents is, that the phrase 'of such' means of such like; that is, of adults being of a childlike disposition; a criticism which takes away all meaning from the words of our Lord. For what kind of reason was it to offer for permitting children to come to Christ to receive his blessing, that persons not children, but who were of a childlike disposition, were the subjects of 'the kingdom of God'? the adsurdity of this is its own refutation, since the reason for children being permitted to come must be found in themselves, and not in others. The second attempt to evade the argument from this passage is, to understand

* Page 116.

the 'kingdom of God' or the 'kingdom of heaven,' as St. Matthew has it, exclusively of the heavenly state. We gladly admit, in opposition to the Calvinistic Baptists, that all children dying before actual sin committed, are admitted into heaven through the merits of Christ; but for this very reason it follows, that infants are proper subjects to be introduced into the church on earth. The phrases, the 'kingdom of God,' and the 'kingdom of heaven,' are, however, more frequently used by our Lord to denote the church in this present world than in its state of glory; and since all the children brought to Christ to receive his blessing were not likely to die in their infancy, it could not be affirmed that 'of such is the kingdom of heaven,' if that be understood to mean the state of future happiness exclusively. As children, they might all be members of the church on earth; but not all, *as children*, members of the church in heaven, seeing they might live to become adults, and be cast away. Thus, therefore, if children are expressly declared to be members of Christ's church, then are they proper subjects of baptism, which is the initiatory rite into every portion of the church which is visible.

"But let this case be more particularly considered.

"Take it that by the 'kingdom of God,' or 'of heaven,' our Lord means the glorified state of the church, it must be granted that none can enter into heaven who are not redeemed by Christ, and who do not stand in a vital relation to him, as members of his mystical body; or otherwise we should place human and fallen beings in that heavenly state, who are unconnected with Christ as their Redeemer, and uncleansed by him as the Sanctifier of his redeemed. Now this relation must exist on earth, before it can exist in heaven, or else we assign the work of sanctifying the fallen nature of man to a future state, which is contrary to the scriptures. If infants, therefore, are thus redeemed and sanctified in their nature, and are before death made 'meet for the inheritance of the saints in light,' so that in this world they are placed in the same relation to Christ as the adult believer, who derives sanctifying influence from him, they are therefore the members of his church, they partake the grace of the covenant, and are comprehended in that promise of the covenant, 'I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.' In other words, they are made members of Christ's church, and are entitled to be recognised as such, by the

administration of the visible sign of initiation into some visible branch of it."*

The Counsel for the Defendants, addressing the Jury, replied as follows:—

Gentlemen, allow me to remind you, that it is your province to keep the whole bearing of the Will before you, and to draw your conclusions from the evidence submitted to you accordingly. There is nothing ambiguous in the Testator's words, "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and truth "requires that a sound, honest meaning be given to plain language." The passages on which you have just heard evidence, are not, as I shall show, of so much importance to the Plaintiff's cause as their Witnesses would wish to make it appear that they are. If you compare what the Testator said to Nicodemus with what he said in these passages to his disciples, you will clearly perceive that the term little children is used in an emblematical sense only. To the former he said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." To the latter, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Here are four different modes of expression, but they have only one tendency; for it is as impossible for a child to be born again in the manner spoken of by the Testator, as it is impossible for a man to be literally transformed into a child. This is demonstrated by the following passage, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," *i. e.*, in the usual course of nature; for even if it were possible for a man, as Nicodemus enquired, to enter a second time into his mother's womb and be born, he would still be a natural man. So, "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," *i. e.*, born anew of the Spirit of God—translated into the heavenly kingdom—"made an heir of the righteousness which is by faith."† Now children, gentlemen, are incapable of this; and the words "of such" can only refer to those who are taught by the word, through the

* Pages 418, 419. † Heb. xi. 7.

influence of the Spirit. These are compared to little children, because, like them, they receive instruction with a willing and unprejudiced mind. None other can, according to these passages, and compatibly with the promise of the Testator, be heirs with Christ.

There is some little variation in the account given in the different gospels of these "little children." Still, all the Testator's words and actions relating to them are designed to inculcate a spirit of humility and innocent simplicity, and to show that without it none can be his disciples. When he took them in his arms, it was obviously to manifest the great estimation in which he held innocency and humility, and as a gentle rebuke to the apostles, who had been disputing "who should be the greatest;" while the following texts prove, as plainly as words and actions can prove, that the Testator's allusion was not to the children, but to his followers, and to them only: "And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them,—(Mark says he took "him in his arms,"*) and said, Verily I say unto *you*, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven; whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven. And whoso shall receive one such little child, in my name, receiveth me. But whoso shall offend *one of these little ones, which believe in me*,"† &c. Can a child, gentlemen, believe in him? Then let these Witnesses blush for their idle attempt to wrest such plain scriptures from their obvious meaning—an attempt unbecoming men who profess to be ministers of the gospel.

It is in vain to reason on the import of our Lord blessing little children. It is nowhere revealed, and therefore we may rest assured that a knowledge of it would neither benefit us nor our children. Every thing essential to our happiness, either as regards our present or future state, is so clearly shown, that "the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."‡ But these Witnesses, not satisfied with what the Spirit of God has been pleased to reveal, take upon themselves to supply what, in their imaginations, appears to be wanting; and tell us, that infants were brought to Christ, "to be preserved from Satan's power,"—"to be made partakers of Christ's kingdom,"—"to receive his official blessing." Well, suppose it were so,—and it can only be supposition,—this certainly supplies

* Mark ix. 36. † Matt. xviii. 2—6. ‡ Isa. xxxv. 8.

no reason why they should arrogate to themselves the power of the Testator, and pretend to transform into saints, by sprinkling a few drops of water on their faces, those who, according to their own statements, are born sinners.

To suppose that infants are capable of receiving the Spirit, is contrary to the Will. We have no record of any receiving it but such as were capable of understanding the word. And it is only by the spiritual application of it to the heart that man can be enlightened. Even the Apostles, who were taught by the Testator himself, could not, from the then weakness of their understanding, bear many things which he had to say to them.* It is incongruous, then, to suppose that the Testator communicated to children that Spirit, which he did not communicate to his apostles until after he had ascended to "the throne of his glory."

Those whom our Lord compared to the children which were brought to him, were no more children in years than those were to whom Paul wrote thus; "Brethren, be not children in understanding; howbeit, in *malice be ye children*, but in understanding be men."† The Testator said to his disciples, "Behold I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves; be ye therefore wise as serpents, and harmless as doves."‡ In Luke it is said, "I send you forth as lambs."§ Now if, as our opponents assert, children are fit subjects of baptism because the Testator in the passages under consideration compares the disciples with children, and tells them that of such is the kingdom of heaven; might it not with equal propriety be inferred that lambs were as fit subjects of baptism as children, because the Testator in these passages compares his disciples with lambs?

These Witnesses, gentlemen, these so-called ministers of the gospel, "carry about" their people with plans and schemes for the salvation of their infants; making them believe that those "which are baptized, and die before they have committed actual sin, shall undoubtedly be saved;" which implies that those who die unbaptized shall undoubtedly be lost. This they most surely believe, or why, as the first Witness remarks, do they "fly for a minister to baptize it," when they perceive their offspring at the point of death?

But observe their incoherencies, gentlemen. After they have by their ceremony made an infant meet to be received into their

* John xvi. 12.
† 1 Cor. xiv. 20.
‡ Matt. x. 16.
§ Luke x. 3.

church, they do not know what to do with it. On the one hand they make it a member, and on the other they refuse it membership. They introduce it into the church by a rite in which it can take no part, and they refuse it the privilege of membership, by withholding from it the bread and wine of which it is capable of partaking, even in an infantile state. There is in this, gentlemen, an incongruity which none of them can reconcile; and it operates against their system so powerfully that they cannot overcome it. Of this the Fifth Witness has shown that he is fully sensible, by leaving on record in this Court the following protest: "This objection," says he, "has in my view a more serious import than any other which has been alleged; and I acknowledge without hesitation, that the conduct of those with whom I am in immediate communion, and, so far as I know them, their opinions also, with regard to this subject, are in a greater or less degree *erroneous* and *indefensible*." And one and all of them are constrained to confess that, after all their solemn pretensions, they are not empowered to remit one sin. For as soon as the child arrives at an age to be able to know good from evil, he is found to be "in evil case;" and the structure which they had reared crumbles into dust.

It may then be again asked, What benefit a child can derive from being christened? Notwithstanding the advantages of it are so much lauded by the Plaintiffs, we can without fear of contradiction reply, Not any: "No, in nowise." Christianity, gentlemen, is a personal matter. It lies wholly with the individual himself and his Creator. Nothing done for him in infancy by another can effect his eternal state in any way;* but if in after-life, under the influence of false teaching, he should place any reliance upon the supposed efficiency of this rite, so far from being a blessing, it would be a snare and a curse to him, by inducing a false confidence that he had by the rite of christening been "made a child of God," although, according to the Will, he had not made a single step towards the knowledge of his name. Listen, gentlemen, to what the Sixth and Seventh Witnesses have said to the adults whom they have christened. The former: "Let all beware of trusting in any measure for their salvation to any outward observance....If you fancy yourselves christians because you have been baptized, you are in the same fatal error in which the Jews were, who imagined themselves the children of Abraham and of God because they were circumcised."† The latter, "Many are disposed

* Psalm xlix. 7. † Pages 213, 214.

to think themselves Christians, because they were baptized in their infancy, and have received what is commonly called a christian education....But if you imagine that any ordinance can operate as a charm, and be relied on as a ground of hope, to the exclusion of the Saviour, you are altogether strangers to the very meaning of christianity."* Thus do the Plaintiffs condemn their own work, a work which has caused myriads to rest in carnal security, and to go down to the grave with "a lie in their right hand."†

Gentlemen, in whatever light we view this ceremony, the consequences are of fatal tendency, both to the christened who survive, and to the christeners; for it is a system of falsehood throughout. The priest, in the first place, causes the sponsors to promise before God what he and they know it is impossible to perform. He puts to them the question following: "Dost thou, in the name of this child, renounce the devil and all his works?" They severally answer, "I renounce them all." Then, as the child grows up, the parents, the school-master, and the priest make it utter a falsehood, by putting the question to it. "Who gave you that name? To which he is *taught* to answer, "My godfathers and my godmothers in my baptism, wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven." And upon Sundays and holidays, the curate is diligently to instruct and examine the child, and make him repeat the falsehood as often as he shall think it convenient. When the child is thought sufficiently versed in these things, the curate shall make it known to the bishop in writing, with his hand subscribed thereunto. After which, the bishop crowns the whole by saying to the child, "Do ye here, in the presence of God...renew the solemn promise and vow that was made in your name at your baptism, ratifying and confirming the same in your own persons, and acknowledging yourselves bound to believe and to do all those things which your godfathers and godmothers then undertook for you?" To this he answers, as previously taught, '*I do.*' "And there shall none be admitted to the holy communion until such time as he has been confirmed, or be ready and desirous to be confirmed," then he may, if he think proper, eat of the supper; or, if otherwise, he may contiue to live as he lived before; it being optional with him; for whether he eat or eat not, he is a confirmed member of the Church of England.

Thus you see, gentlemen, a child is inducted into what is called

* Page 229. † Isaiah xliv. 20.

the church, by being taught to answer, parrot-like, a few questions Observe, also, gentlemen, the negligent and hurried manner in which it is inducted. Each child answers for itself, to do all that its godfathers and godmothers promised for it. Now it must be known, to all who read the Prayer-book, that no child hath two of each. But this is a short and expeditious way of performing the ceremony, making one question and one answer serve for both sexes. Whether consistent with the fact, I leave those to answer who perform it. The whole of the ceremony being a mere matter-of-course affair, no one would expect the officiating persons to be very particular whom they receive, or in what manner they receive them. I once heard, in this neighbourhood, a bishop say when addressing the children previous to his laying hands on them, "I suppose you all know what you came here for; and if you don't, you ought to know."

See, then, gentlemen, what a contradiction is involved in the "Rubric." It says a child is, and it teaches a child to believe that it was made, a member of Christ, &c., when it was christened; yet it does not acknowledge him as such, until after he is, or is ready to be confirmed. This, as the Fifth Witness truly asserts, "is irreconcileable with any scriptural view of the nature and importance of the sacrament;" yet this incongruity is in general little noticed, if noticed at all. Parents send their children to be confirmed, as they send them to be christened, as a matter of course; and as a matter of course, notwithstanding all the iniquity they may since have committed, they are confirmed "children of God." And this involves a still greater contradiction; for the Rubric does not guarantee their salvation any longer than they remain free from actual transgression. Thus the solemn mockery is completed; but an awful responsibility rests on the heads of those through whose instrumentality the rites are so administered. They will have to answer for "transgressing the laws, changing the ordinances, and breaking the everlasting covenant."*

The remark of a clergyman of the Establishment is worthy of observation. "All sponsors are believers, all the baptized are regenerate, all the confirmed forgiven, all the catechumens elect, all kings religious, all the dead subjects of thankfulness... to the total oblivion of the present and eternal distinction between the saved and the lost. The consequences glare and blaze in the feelings of

* Isaiah xxiv. 5.

self-satisfaction which our poor deluded victims enjoy, as supposing all their sins are blotted out,... not by having boldness to enter in to the holiest, by the new and living way, but as obeying the demands of the church, and in such demand seeing nothing to disturb the guilty, nor to soothe a penitent mind; I mean, seeing of this with such distinctness as would be the case if the liturgical language were as clear, cautionary, and guarded as we adopt in protecting our worldly interest."

I am not ashamed, gentlemen, to confess myself ignorant of all the consequences which the Plaintiffs attach to what they term "original sin." That, through our descent from Adam, we are subject to disease and death, in consequence of his first offence, is easy to comprehend; but that we stand in the eyes of our Creator as actual sinners in consequence of that offence, and shall hereafter be brought to account for it, is beyond our comprehension, and beyond the power of these Witnesses to prove. If I understand them rightly, their chief reason for sprinkling infants is, to cleanse them from what they call "inherent sin;" and they derive their precedent, and the plea for their conduct, from the circumstance that the Israelites, under the old dispensation, circumcised their male children. If this be the case, they act inconsistently; because they can gather nothing from the Abrahamic covenant in support of it. The promises attached to that covenant were all prospective; the rite had no reference to the past, and consequently none to any native impurity. This is self-evident; for if it were otherwise, then all who had died previous to the eighth day after their birth, and all the females, must have gone down to the grave under sin.

The Jews entertained a false opinion, which became a proverb among them. But for this they were reproved by the Lord, who said, "What mean ye that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth, it shall die. But if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, and... hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, he is just, he shall surely live.... If he beget a son that is a robber, a shedder of blood,... and that doeth not any of those duties,... shall he then live? He shall not live; he shall surely die; his blood shall be upon him. Now,

lo, if he beget a son that seeth all his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like,...he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, he shall surely live. As for his father, because he cruelly oppressed,... lo, even he shall die in his iniquity. Yet ye say, Why? doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live. The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son."*

From these scriptures, it is manifest that no man will come under condemnation for the sin of another; and it is equally manifest that every one stands in the sight of God in his individual capacity, accountable for his own sins only. Any rite, therefore, founded upon the contrary supposition, as infant sprinkling avowedly is, is worse than useless, and, as I have before observed, must be attended with fatal consequences.

It is said in the prophets, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself."† This corresponds with what Solomon says, "God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions."‡ Jeremiah asks, and the same question and answer may with equal propriety be applied to the days in which we live—"Hath a nation changed their gods, which are yet no gods? But my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit."§

You will remember, gentlemen, that Acts ii. 39 has been referred to, also, as authority for christening infants. The words of Peter, although they were addressed to Jews, had a reference to Gentiles also, these being termed "afar off;" but the closing sentence gives the true elucidation of the promise. It is to "as many as the Lord our God shall call." This promise was not made to the infants, as such, of either people, for they can neither comprehend nor embrace the blessing. But it was made to ALL people and tongues, and to such of their descendants, in every age, as shall be made capable of understanding and receiving it. As it is written, "In every nation, he that feareth him and worketh righteousness is accepted with him."‖

"The promise is to you and to your children." These words are interpreted by the Witnesses as implying that the promise is made

* Ezek. xviii. † Hos. xiii. 9. ‡ Eccles. vii. 29.
§ Jer. ii. 11. ‖ Acts x. 35.

to children in their infant state; and it is the opinion of the majority of them, that it refers to the infants of believers only; or, which is tantamount in their opinion, to the infants of those whom the world calls *good men*. But Peter's words convey no such meaning. He was speaking to a mixed multitude, to which he addressed the following stern reproof; "Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you, by miracles, and wonders, and signs which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, *ye* have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain." Yet it was to these men that he said, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you." To these vile characters that he said, "The promise is to you, and to your children," (those who shall come after you.) "And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."* Thus the promise was then, is now, and shall be, to every believer, in every generation, so long as the world continues. No man has a right to expect any blessing, but in the way of God's appointment; but every man has a right to look up to him by prayer to be brought to a knowledge of that way.†

Gentlemen, do not the Plaintiffs leave their earthly property in trust, until their children come of age; so that unless they survive, they never come into possession? But the reverse is the case with them in respect of heavenly things. They pretend to put their infants into possession a few days after they are born, with a proviso that if they survive they may lose their patrimony.

The Witnesses, gentlemen, as you must have observed, are in the habit of making assertions which they do not attempt to prove. They assume things, argue upon them as facts, and then, by much sophistry, make out a case which satisfies the religious world, who generally take for granted all that is advanced by men denominated *evangelical*, *pious*, and *learned*. But you, gentlemen, will show by your verdict that you require something more solid. You remember that

The First Witness takes a correct view of one of the passages under consideration. Christ, says he, "considers a little child an emblem of a disciple; and that by the term, one 'such' little child, he means a disciple only." But not so of the other, for he takes our Lord's expressions literally, and tells you a great part of God's

* Acts ii. 22, 23. 38, 39. 21. † Isa. xlv. 22.

kingdom is composed of children in years. If, according to his first proposition, children are emblems, they cannot be disciples: if, according to his second, they are disciples, they cannot be emblems.

But let us inquire, gentlemen, who are the persons in whose heart Moloch takes up his abode. Are they not those with whom this Witness is joined in affinity—those who, one and all, declare by their prayer-book, that "every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation;"* those, many of whom speak out boldly, and directly assert that "all human beings are born in sin; and that a child, until it is baptized, remains in a heathen state,—is not a participator of the privileges and hopes of the gospel, nor an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven;"† those also, who may not perhaps go the full length of these expressions, but who practise and advocate the rite that calls them forth; and those finally who do not look upon all infants as in the sight of God alike, and thus debar the greatest portion of them of what they imagine a sort of passport to the kingdom of heaven. Nor do I consider this Witness himself quite free from the "diabolical system." Why does he christen infants, if it is not to forward their salvation, and thus make it manifest that the unchristened are in a dangerous state? If this is not the case, then he must allow christening to be a useless rite, a device of man, a thing of "none effect."

Again, if a great portion of the kingdom of God is composed of children in years, then the great benefit of the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ would extend no farther than to replace us in that state of innocency in which Adam was before he fell.‡ But the future happiness of those who die in infancy will not bear a comparison with the "eternal weight of glory" which those shall receive who through faith are made "joint-heirs with Christ,"§ and "kings and priests unto God."‖ For Christ does much more than restore that which was forfeited by Adam. He not only purifies us from sin, but he changes us into his own image, "from glory to glory;"¶ and thus makes us, conjointly with himself, sons of God; for "he that sanctifieth, and those who are sanctified, are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren."** This is a doctrine with which the Witnesses do not appear to be

* Ninth Article.

† Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, Tract, No. 191.

‡ See Jer. xxxi. 16, 17. § Rom. viii. 16, 17. ‖ Rev. i. 5, 6.

¶ 2 Cor. iii. 18. ** Heb. ii. 11.

familiar, otherwise their statements are very delusive. You will recollect, gentlemen, what this Witness has previously said; "only the Power that made the man at first, can new-make him; no circumcision can do this." I am then at a loss to know how it can be done by christening, which the Plaintiffs regard as a substitute for it. And you will recollect his just remark on this clause, that our Lord here "intimates also that wherever this principle (self-abasement and humility,) should be found, it would save its possessor from seeking worldly honours or earthly profits, and from seeking to be a *ruler* over his brethren, or a lord in God's heritage."

The Second Witness followed pretty nearly in the footsteps of the First. The First asserted positively that a great part of God's kingdom consisted of children; whereas the Second has to presume four things before he arrives at the same conclusion. And, after all, he freely acknowledges that the children were not brought to the Testator to be baptized, but to be preserved from bodily diseases and from Satan's power. Children, gentlemen, are not within the range of the commission; they are incapable of being taught, how then can they be changed from nature to grace, and from grace to glory? while nothing less, according to *his* showing, "would bring them to heaven."

We have paid much attention, gentlemen, to the evidence of the Third Witness, but have been unable to catch his meaning. First, he says, *every* unbeliever, and every sinner, although made by baptism a member of Christ and a child of God, must be in a certain sense converted, if he would ultimately succeed to his inheritance. Then he scoffs at the idea that a person cannot be saved, who never knew a time that he had need of a change from darkness to light; or that a change of mind in *every* person is requisite for his salvation. Next, he declares that *every man* has sinned, and will need the atoning blood of the Redeemer; while afterward he denies it, by saying that *some* humble christians undoubtedly there are, who, having been once regenerated by water (*i. e.*, "christened," for he allows of no other regeneration,) and the Holy Spirit, need no change. To us these statements appear a tissue of contradictions, which we must leave to his constituents to unravel; in the mean time I shall make a few remarks upon what I presume he intended his statements to convey.

The humble christians, to whom he thinks a change of mind

unnecessary, I understand to be those who, after they have been christened, pass a good moral life, which cannot be too highly appreciated; but if so, his statement is not only at variance with the Will, but with the eleventh Article of his Church, which says, "We are not accounted righteous for our works or deservings." And he himself asserts, that *every* sinner, although *made* by baptism a child of God, must be converted if he would ultimately be saved. There is no exception here, gentlemen, "for all have sinned." The only conclusion which can legitimately be drawn from this assertion respecting all who have been cherished under the fostering wing of the Establishment, and who have been made to say, a thousand times over, "I heartily thank our heavenly Father, that he hath called me to this state of salvation," is this, that the church hath deceived them — that it hath not actually made them what it professes to have made them — that it hath not regenerated them — that in their present state they have no claim under the Will, and that, ultimately to succeed to its inestimable blessings, they must be taught of God. In short, it is a candid confession that his predecessors, who commenced the tower, did not first sit down and count the cost; for certainly many that behold it may take up the language of mockery, and say, These men began to build, and were not able to finish.* For a long time they have deceived the inexperienced, by putting on their edifice a fair outside; but the messengers sent to watch over the true church have, by the power given them by the Spirit of the Testator, scraped off the "untempered mortar" with which the "builders daubed it," and have thus exposed to view the weakness and worthlessness of the superstructure they have reared. The power of the Almighty Word is now shaking it, and stone after stone is falling in such rapid succession as to surprise even the descendants of the early architects. What remains of it is "as a bowing wall or a tottering fence,"† a monument of the folly of the builders. There appear signs abroad that the time is approaching, which, according to the prophecies of Daniel and the Revelator, will bring destruction upon every house which is not established upon the "Rock of Ages;" and it shall be desolate, as the proud city of which Seraiah said, after he had bound a stone to the prophetic book, and cast it into the midst of the Euphrates, "Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her."‡ As it is said, "Therefore wait ye

* Luke xiv. 29. † Psalm lxii. 3. ‡ Jer. li. 64.

upon me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey; for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour out upon them my indignation, even all my fierce anger, for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy. For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent."*

Gentlemen, are we not warranted in these remarks? And do not the schisms now prevalent in the Establishment, many of which have originated in the discoveries of its tottering state, and which are now sapping its already insecure foundation, indicate that its destruction is sealed? Does not the Testator affirm that "if a house be divided against itself, that house cannot stand"?†

Again, gentlemen, does not the evidence of this Witness make it clear that "baptismal regeneration" is a "will with the wisp" sort of a thing, which the majority of churchmen even never get a sight of; and would not the few that fancy they do, and who follow it through all its mazes, confess, if they dared to speak out, that it leads them into "miry places"?

The founder of Methodism, gentlemen, was correct in his statement, notwithstanding the sneer of this Witness. The three thousand who, on the day of Pentecost, were pricked to the heart, knew well that they had need of a great and mighty change; and that that change they experienced, when in their conversion they had received the gift of the Holy Ghost?

Nor was his Calvinistic competitor less correct in what he asserted respecting conversion, although in what he said of congregations he was not so thoroughly correct. Allowing that there are among the congregations of the churches of Christ two distinct and widely different sorts of people, there may be what are denominated christian congregations of one sort only, and that sort unbelievers. But to suppose that there are two sorts of people in *every* congregation, may well appear in the eyes of this Witness "an unwarrantable conceit?" for according to his views, the thing is manifestly impossible. Every congregation of the Establishment is composed of "men baptized as christians, brought up from their infancy to believe the doctrines, and practise the duties, of christianity." They have all one standard of faith, the "Book of Common Prayer." They use the self-same prayers, exhortations, and lessons which it contains,

* Zeph. iii. 8, 9. † Mark iii. 24.

and which are made to suit all its members as one body, the pious and the impious, from the day that they are christened to the day of their death. The children and the fathers are fed with the same "meat," while there is nothing in the book, from the beginning to the end of it, which indicates a difference of character among those who call themselves churchmen. Nay, the book has borne the stamp of perfection for nearly three hundred years; and both the clergy and the laity, old and young, are alike guided by it, alike confined within its narrow circle, and beyond which none are allowed to pass, on pain of *suspension* or excommunication. In short, it is their all in all. I once heard it affirmed, by a highly popular vicar in the diocese of York, that "the Prayer-book is the only thing that embodies true theology;" and I hold in my hand, gentlemen, a publication wherein it is asserted that "as the book...confirmed by the law of the land, was previously established by the convocation or synods of the church itself, it has therefore over the clergy all the authority, ecclesiastical and civil, that any book can have over the consciences of any men; and so long as they continue clergymen of the church, they ought to obey it. None other but the prayers in that book ought to be used, strictly speaking, by the clergy; and as to the manner, and form, and course of using them, no other mode ought to be adopted than that which is prescribed by the rubrics therein contained."*

Although his evangelical brethren come under the lash of this Witness, the texts which are now before us prove them in this instance to be right. The Testator said, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." These words were addressed to his apostles, whom he had before chosen out of the whole Jewish family; and surely if they stood in need of conversion, how much more do those stand in need of it who know nothing of the matter except by report.

But what does he mean by the following?—"By that blood (the Redeemer's), they have been purified from the original corruption of their nature; by that blood they have been cleansed from their actual sins; by the Holy Spirit of God they have been regenerated." Is he of opinion that his choice christians were, when they were christened, cleansed from all sins they might thenceforward commit, even before they committed them? If he is, he not only differs

* The Law of the Rubric, by the Rev. Augustus Campbell, A.M., Rector of Liverpool.

from the Will, but from the sixteenth Article of the Church, which he has subscribed, and also from the Rubrics. See "The Public Baptism of Infants."

The Fourth Witness said, that the Testator did not order these infants to be baptized; and why? Because "baptism was not then explicitly instituted as the initiatory ordinance, and circumcision was still in force." It is true, circumcision was in force until the law was fulfilled and finished by the death of the Testator. But after he arose from the grave, and immediately before he ascended into his glory, he established the ordinance which his heavenly Father had previously instituted, and thenceforward made baptism a positive command, which all who should be called by his grace were to observe, and by it confess his name.* The commission, as recorded by Matthew,† is sufficient to assure every candid, enquiring individual that children are not included in it.

This Witness still pays some attention to the dictates of conscience, seeing he speaks so very guardedly; he says, the expression "seems to mean," that the passage "seems to give considerable sanction," &c. The language of Mark, he says, is more emphatic than that of Matthew, but he can draw no "direct" proof even from that; yet without using any of these modest terms, he directly asserts that infants are as capable of regeneration as grown persons. According to him, they may share in the second Adam's gracious covenant, without personal faith and obedience; but not without the regenerating influence of the Spirit of Christ. Well, then, as the Established Church acknowledges none but the christened regenerate, must it not follow that all unchristened infants "are shut out of heaven"? And is not this Witness' own proposition far more dreadful than any held by the most unfeeling and presumptuous supralapsarian Calvinist?

Regeneration, gentlemen, is "newness of life," being given to the dead (in sin),‡ through the power of the Holy Spirit, which guides them into all truth.§ How then can an unconscious but guiltless being be capable of it? What can it matter to the infant, whether the christening be done intelligently and rightly or otherwise? And what even to the Plaintiff's cause, when, according to their own Witness, if it *were* so done, there would be only *ground to conclude* that the *aspect is favourable* towards bringing infants to Christ.

* Acts viii. 37; Rom. x. 10.
† Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.
‡ John v. 25.
§ John xvi. 13.

Very trifling indeed, even in the opinion of the Fifth Witness, is the advantage which children that die in infancy, after they have been rightly christened, have over those who die in like manner without being christened at all. There is, he says, *much* and *very consoling* reason to believe the former are accepted, and reason to *hope well* concerning the latter. Here is a distinction without a difference, which clearly exhibits the emptiness and uselessness of the ceremony. This Witness told you that the christened were doubly assured of a religious education; but when cross-examined, he confessed that, in many instances, both parents and children are lamentably ignorant of the truths it declares, and the privileges it confers. It is difficult, indeed, to see how it could be otherwise, gentlemen, when, in the plainest terms, he acknowledges that he himself is ignorant of them.

The Sixth Witness admits that the phrase "of such" means persons possessing the disposition of children; but asserts, that if it does not include the children themselves, "the reason for receiving them would have been as applicable to lambs and doves." As far as it respects their innocency, it would; and if he were to christen lambs and doves on that account, the holy ordinance of the Testator would not be a whit more desecrated than it is by christening the infants of what he calls believers. The ordinance of baptism was instituted as the introduction of a believer into the Church of Christ, and of a believer only. As it is said, "when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women."* When baptism, therefore, or any rite substituted for it, is administered to any other object, whether to an infant, a lamb, or a bell, there can be no difference in the sin, all being alike unconscious things.

In this view of the matter, I am supported by a clergyman who has recently written on the subject. "Whatever difficulty," says he, "may be conceived to arise respecting *sponsion*, as regeneration is *there* (in private baptism,) ascribed to baptism, though no sponsors engage, it is obvious that at most it can only in a case of necessity be viewed as an EXCEPTION from the general rule, and by no means taken as a *rule* subverting the general requirements. *Sponsion* must *there* in all fairness and wisdom be *implied*, though the urgency of the circumstances would not allow of the formal *stipulation*.... If this

* Acts viii. 12.

implied sponsion be *denied*, I should at once assert that such infants never received CHRISTIAN *baptism* at all; for *christian* baptism includes baptizing into the *faith of Christ*, and entering into covenant with Christ, as well as introduction into the holy catholic church of Christ. But as infants cannot do any of these in their own persons, and have nobody to do it for them, it is perfectly clear that there is no *christian* baptism in such cases. You may just as wisely pretend to baptize an animal *thus* as a man, and it would be just as rational."*

The difference, gentlemen, between a natural little child and a spiritual child is this; the natural child receives its first instruction after it is born—the spiritual one before; and when the latter is led by the teaching of the Holy Spirit to believe of his own knowledge, to be satisfied that Christ died for his sins, and to confess the same in the way appointed, thus making manifest his new birth, he is then, and not before, acknowledged to be a joint heir with Christ, and a member of his body, entitled to be inducted into all the privileges and immunities of his spiritual kingdom; just as a child born in this country is entitled to all the privileges of his birthright. But neither the one nor the other is capable of enjoying them fully until they arrive at the age of mature experience. Hence young believers, no matter how long they have lived in the world, are reckoned little children, or babes in Christ.† Observe, also, gentlemen, what this Witness has himself said in another place; he is speaking, indeed, on another subject, but his remarks will apply equally well to the one before us. "Thus it was *then;* and is not this sufficient ground for the conclusion that thus it ought to be *still?* Some say, No. They allege that the constitution then given was adapted to existing circumstances, but not designed to continue imperative in succeeding ages. Of this, however, there is an utter destitution of proof. The imagination of the necessity of change arises from the overlooking of the simple fact itself for which we contend, the entire distinctness, in character and in constitution, of the kingdom of Christ, from all the kingdoms of this world. It stands alone. Its subjects are believers in Christ, sinners saved by his grace, out of 'every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation.' It is the same in every country, and under every state of

* THE KEY TO MODERN CONTROVERSY, by the Rev. G. Bugg, B.A., Curate of Desborough, page 60.

† See 1 Cor. iii. 1, 2.

society, and every form of civil government. If its proper nature be but well understood, it will at once be apparent that by varieties in these it is altogether unaffected; and therefore that the principles on which it was originally constituted must continue always equally suitable. If the materials of the spiritual community remain the same, the constitution which was divinely adapted to those materials at the first must ever possess the same adaptation; and they who fancy a change necessary in the *constitution*, must have previously admitted into their minds some conception different from that sanctioned in the New Testament, of *the nature of the kingdom*."*

I can suppose no greater change, gentlemen, that could possibly be made in the constitution of the kingdom of Christ, than that men, this Witness among the rest, should pretend to constitute babes born after the flesh, instead of babes born after the Spirit, citizens of that kingdom; and not only pretending to make citizens of them, but taking upon themselves to judge what infants are eligible, and what are not. Certainly if one class be eligible, another may be, since all come into the world alike. Where is the man that can discover any difference between an infant born of a saint, and one born of a sinner? Who can tell which of the two shall be wise, and which foolish, or whether both may not be wise, or both foolish? I presume this Witness would not christen an adult idiot, though born of what he calls believing parents; yet he would have christened him when an infant. It is a well known fact, that all children do not tread in the footsteps of their parents; witness the sons of Samuel, and the sons of Amon, king of Judah.†

According to the statement of this Witness, christening "teaches that even from the womb children are subjects of pollution, and that they stand in need of pardon for their original apostacy, in order to their seeing God." And "their original corruption," says the Fifth Witness, "is therefore taught by this ordinance, in a language that cannot be misunderstood. From these acknowledgments, gentlemen, I feel that we are authorised to presume, then, that christening was established previous to the doctrine of original sin being taught; and that when the institutors of it were pressed to state upon what they grounded such an incongruous rite, they had recourse to original sin; and to prove that view to be scriptural, they referred the enquirers to Psalm li. 5. Why, gentlemen, this is applying a cure

* Voluntary Church Controversy in Liverpool, page 6.

† 1 Sam. viii. 3; 2 Kings xxii. 2.

to a disease, before they have proved that the disease exists. My learned friend, indeed, seems to be aware of this, when he asks, "Unto what sin does an infant die, if it has not contracted original sin?" And what says the Eighth Witness, on Psalm li. 5? Why that it alludes "to the bitter sorrows in which, in consequence of the first sin, the woman is sentenced to conceive and bring forth."

We are not to imagine, gentlemen, that my learned friend, the Counsel for the Plaintiffs, was ignorant of the bearing of this passage. He understood it too well to introduce it in support of this doctrine. —That David's mother was a sinner is evident, for "there is no one that sinneth not." And that she suffered, in conception and parturition, for the sin of Eve, is equally certain. But it by no means follows from these things that David was born a sinner. Nowhere in the scriptures is it even hinted, that man came into the world doomed to pay any other penalty on account of Adam's transgression than that of "the common death." What said Solomon, David's son, a man to whom the Lord gave more natural understanding than he gave to any other man, either before or after him?* "God hath made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions."† Gentlemen, if there be a proof or example that sin is hereditary, it is furnished by those who, treading in the steps of our first parents, lay the cause of their sinning upon another. Still this only holds good in part: Eve laid the blame of her sin on the serpent, and Adam that of his on the woman; but the Plaintiffs' excuse for sin is ORIGINAL—they appear occasionally to attribute it to their Creator,—to him who asks, by his prophet Isaiah, "What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done in it? Wherefore, when I looked that it should bring forth grapes, brought it forth wild grapes,"‡—to him who declares, "I had planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed; how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine to me!"§

Undoubtedly it was the sin of our first parents which forfeited our natural life; but then, their fall did not affect our spiritual being; for spiritual or eternal life, according to the scriptural acceptation of the term, they did not possess previous to their fall. Whence, then, was the origin of their sin? they had no predecessors, and yet they fell into sin, quite as readily as we their offspring do now. It is certain, gentlemen, that there can be "no sin where

* 1 Kings iii. 12.
† Eccl. vii. 29.
‡ Isaiah v. 4.
§ Jer. ii. 21.

there is no law;"* and equally certain that Christ redeemed all mankind from the effects of Adam's sin. That sin only affected our natural condition; it did not pollute the heart, as our own sins do. For how is it possible there can be sin in any soul before that soul is capable of committing it, and knowing when it is committed, that it is sin? All men know when they are about to commit sin; and they know also that they have the power within themselves, if they would exert that power, to refrain from it. One of our moral writers has said, "the woman that deliberates is lost." Why is this? Because she does not attend to the first dictates of conscience; like Eve, instead of driving the deceiver from her, she listens to his delusive persuasion, conscience loses all power, and her fall is the consequence. The Plaintiffs may plead "that Adam, being polluted, nothing could proceed from him but what must be polluted. This would have been true, if sin had been essential to his being; but that was not the case, for then sin could not have been destroyed, unless his being had been destroyed. Sin is a disease that cleaves to the soul, but it is not the essence of the soul; therefore it may be separated. We receive our being from Adam's essence, not his defilement. Death, not sinfulness, passed upon all."

Besides, gentlemen, we know that no fountain can naturally rise higher than its source. Our first parents, therefore, could not transmit to us greater perverseness than they themselves possessed. But that we are more perverse than they were, I think is manifest. Eve knew only good, but vainly desired to know what evil was. This knowledge she obtained to perfection, as all her daughters can testify. Well, we have now the knowledge of both; not perhaps of natural good to the same extent as they had, but to the same extent we have the knowledge of evil; while at the same time we have a knowledge ten thousand times greater than they had how we may be effectually released from this evil; and yet, we will not exert that knowledge. For their advantage, they were forbidden to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. It does not appear that they were forbidden to eat of the tree of life, although they were driven out of the garden, lest, in their fallen state, they should eat of it. But how different is it with us! Instead of being driven from it, we are invited to it. It is planted directly in our daily path, and the most persuasive language is employed to induce us to partake of

* See Rom. v. 13.

its precious fruit! Whosoever will may eat of it, and those who eat of it shall never die, but live for ever. And yet, surprising as it may appear, it is only here and there a passenger who thinks it worth the trouble of lifting his hand to pluck it. Had our first parents known, as their descendants know, or might know if they would, the life-giving power which it contains, instead of covering themselves with fig-leaves, as many now "cover themselves with their works,"* they would have flown to it, and with its leaves have covered their nakedness.† But, gentlemen, it is vain attempting to prove a fact, and thus unnecessarily to take up your time. We either come into the world pure from sin, or the Saviour of the world came into it impure; for "in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren,"‡ "compassed by infirmity,"§ and "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin."‖

Gentlemen, we might find it difficult to account for the Plaintiffs' being so much attached to the doctrine of original sin, and so tenacious of retaining it, had not an individual, who stands pre-eminently high in the religious world, enlightened us on the subject. He writes:—"I am glad to have incurred all the forfeitures which were laid upon Adam and his degenerate offspring, as this is the very thing which has brought me within the scope of a most glorious amnesty, and a most ample restoration. I will not quarrel with the doctrine of original sin, but hold it a kindness to have it laid before me, as to me it is the very finger-post which points my way of access and of triumph to that righteousness which is unto all and upon all who believe. It is a singular dealing of God, that he should rate me for another's sin, and evinces his ways to be not as men's ways; but I will not complain of it, as I have a most secure and honourable refuge in another dealing of God's equally singular, but in which it is my chiefest interest, and will at length be my most exalted felicity, to acquiesce—even that he should reward me for another's obedience, and that instead of looking to me as I am in myself, or looking to me as I am in Adam, He should look unto me as I am in Christ, and lavish upon me all that benignity which he feels towards his only-beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased."¶ Thus the writer makes sin a blessing, and implies that the Almighty could not have fulfilled his purpose independent of it. My learned friend is also somewhat of this opinion. His language is:—"It

* Isa. lix. 6. † Rev. xxii. 2. ‡ Heb. ii. 17. § Heb. v 2.
‖ Heb. iv. 15. ¶ Dr. Chalmers' Lectures on the Romans.

seemed better to thee (the Almighty,) to cast down, in order to restore, than altogether to uphold, so as to need no restoration."* But, gentlemen, let us always remember that sin is of man, salvation of God.

All that has been previously stated by this Witness, in favour of these little innocents being proper subjects of baptism, because it is of "such" that the kingdom of heaven is composed, is forgotten. They are now made subjects of pollution from the womb, standing in need of pardon for their original apostacy; so that they who were before presumed to be christened on account of their being born for the kingdom of heaven, are now christened to purify them from inherent depravity. And it is painful to observe how this Witness added to the scriptures, by saying, "surely as a little child receives it." There is a wide difference betwixt the expression "receiving the kingdom as a little child receives it," and receiving the kingdom of God in the same simplicity as a little child receives the first elements of instruction. This is another proof how readily the Witnesses can wrest the scriptures, in the vain endeavour to maintain a cause which the Plaintiffs admit to be untenable, by having recourse to such flagitious means, and "by cunning to make those things seem truest, which are the fittest to serve their purpose."

The evidence of this Witness, like that of the Fifth, is vacillating and inconsistent. After all we have heard of the necessity and utility of christening infants, he says, in his cross-examination, "We (the Plaintiffs,) do not consider the outward rite as essential to salvation; far be it from us to deny that infants may be acknowledged to be of the kingdom of God without baptizing them; far be it from us to pass any sentence of exclusion against the children of our Baptist brethren." Well, then, by his own admission they are born pure, for nothing "that defileth" can enter into the "holy Jerusalem."†

But observe, gentlemen, how he contradicts himself. He has previously declared that infants stand in need of purification from their inward depravity, in order to their entering heaven and seeing God; and I see not how, on his shewing, this purification can be accomplished in any other manner than by christening them, since he has said that "the significance of baptism is to be found in the purifying nature of the element employed."

* Sermons on the Second Advent, by the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, M. A., first edition, page 163.

† Rev. xxi. 27.

This infant christening must be either right or wrong. It is either required by the Testator, or it is not. If the Witness believes in his heart that it is required, he is bound, as a professing minister of the gospel, to maintain it, and warn us of our negligence. He ought not to "halt between two opinions," endeavouring to conciliate parties as opposed to each other as light is to darkness; he should himself take warning from Ezekiel xxxiii. 1—8. But the irresolute tone of his evidence indicates that he is doubtful of its favourable reception. His arguments, for which he claims a scriptural foundation, are stated according to the confidence he has in the soundness of the doctrine he is desirous to establish; as I will prove to you, gentlemen, by reading another extract from one of his pamphlets.

"We ought," says he, "to conduct the controversy with *a due combination of firmness and gentleness—of resolute adherence to truth, and the meekness and lowliness of Christ.*

"There are some persons who are the subjects of a morbid aversion to all controversy. They cannot endure the very word. And they fancy this aversion quite a virtue. They plume themselves upon it. They are men of peace. 'Let them contend who will,' they say; 'it is not at all our element—we like quietness. We would rather let those who differ from us have it all their own way, than be for ever fighting about it. Let them alone.' I have no sympathy with such sickly sentimentalism. I can call it by no better name. It is not the love of truth, nor the desire either to discover or to maintain it; it is the mere love of repose and quiescence. It is not self-denial, however it may try to pass itself under that name; it is self-indulgence, an indolent listlessness as to all that ought to rouse to emotion and to gird to action. It is a sluggish apathy, that glides at its ease with the stream, and will not make an effort to stem the current and make way against it, even for the sake of saving itself and others from threatened evil. It has not vigour enough to grasp and keep hold of a principle. It is so unwilling to give offence that it will rather allow another to remain in error, than to tell him he is wrong; nay, will rather appear as if assenting to the error, than venture to avow the truth; and, from mere deficiency of mental resolution and moral courage, will take part in what it admits to be wrong, or at least doubts of being right, rather than run the risque of giving umbrage by acting consistently and manfully up to its convictions. It were a sinful abuse of terms to call this weak-minded indecision a christian virtue. It is the virtue of the

well-polished, well-balanced, well-oiled weathercock, that shifts with every breath of the shifting wind. If such weathercocks do occupy high places, their elevation is not to be envied.

"In maintaining such a resolute adherence to truth, as, in contra-distinction to this vacillating pusillanimity, I now commend, there may be sacrifices required of no trivial amount. By no soundly-thinking mind, by no rightly-feeling heart, will the disruption of the bonds of christian intimacy and cordial fellowship be lightly accounted of. I grant, because I feel, deeply feel, the painfulness of the present state of christian society. In some quarters I hear this dwelt upon and sighed over with unceasing regrets. With my whole heart I join in regretting the effect, but I cannot regret the cause. I cannot wish undone what has been done. I cannot wish a return to the former state of things. I cannot sympathize with the exclamation, 'O that it were with us as in days past!' If any shall marvel at this, and charge me with undervaluing the peace of the church, and the pleasures of brotherly communion with 'all that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity,' I answer, No. It is not that I value these little, but that there is something that I value more. Precious as christian friendships are, truth, divine truth, is more precious still; the interests of the Church of God are more precious still. I adopt, therefore, in the spirit of them, the words put by our great dramatist into the lips of the patriot Brutus; 'Not that I loved Cæsar less, but that I loved Rome more.' Not that I loved my friends and companions less, but that I loved Zion more; not that I loved my fellow-servants less, but that I loved my Master more. I say further; precious as the peace of the church is, it is only precious when it is the peace of principle. That peace is not precious that is the result of insensibility to error and corruption, an insensibility which will rather allow the waters of the sanctuary to stagnate into pestilential putridity, than stir them with a freshening and healthful agitation. What would the state of the world at this day have been had the apostles of the Lamb been actuated by this morbid dread of disturbing its peace? Had they preferred peace to truth, instead of earning for themselves the designation of 'the men that turned the world upside down,' they would have allowed the world to have reposed in the death-sleep of sin and error. And what at this hour would have been the condition of the church in our own country, and in the Protestant nations of Europe, had the reformers acted on the principle of this torpid apathy? Slumbering on, in all her long-established and inveterate corruptions,

If peace is founded in, and maintained by, error, its disturbance is salutary. Ultimate peace, only of a kind more legitimate and more desirable, is the very end anxiously anticipated of all such disturbance. A passing storm, though partially injurious, and for the time alarming, will purify the stagnant atmosphere, and prepare for a salubrious calm. To that consummation we look forward with delight. It may not arrive in our day; but it will come, and we must not, in the spirit of selfishness, satisfy ourselves with a lethargic peace in our own time, at the expense of the interests of the Church of God in future generations. In order to this ultimate and happy result, truth must be held paramount, and maintained in its rightful supremacy. Jehovah complained, in ancient times, of those who 'were not valiant for the truth in the land.' To be 'valiant for the truth,' then, is a duty; and seeing our gracious Master requires not impossibilities and contradictions, it must be quite possible to be thus valiant for the truth, and yet to contend for it in the spirit which he approves—the spirit of peace."*

This, gentlemen, is sound doctrine,—doctrine which deserves to be written in letters of gold—doctrine which ought to be observed by every believer who is desirous of having the truth maintained in its purity—doctrine which, had it been observed by the church of the Laodiceans, would have exempted it from the severe and abasing sentence of the Almighty†—doctrine which, coming from this Witness, convinces us that, as it respects the subject of which he was speaking, he felt the ground on which he was treading firm. If he had felt it to be so in the cause before us, he would not have exposed himself to the reproof he so ably and deservedly bestows on others, whose example, he hesitates not in this Court, to follow.

His own conduct, gentlemen, sufficiently manifests the inconsistency of his system. Doubtless he feels that his system merits "all the scorn and ridicule" with which, he deplores, it is so much assailed. He excludes a large portion of the children of his own congregation, by not applying to them the SIGN which he applies to those who, according to his assertion, *are* admitted to be capable of the thing signified; thus tacitly condemning all the children who are incapable of it. And yet he does not pass any sentence of exclusion against the unchristened children of his "Baptist brethren."

* Voluntary Church Controversy in Liverpool, page 20—23.

† Rev. iii. 15, 16.

Here, gentlemen, there is an incongruity—some little of the "well-oiled weathercock"—some attempt to conciliate his opponents, and preserve peace. It appears to him, as it appears also to the Fourth Witness, that "infant baptism is the privilege of the parent, rather than the privilege of the child." I doubt if he is prepared to say, that the child enters heaven merely through the privilege of the parent. And if the rite be requisite to cleanse that child from its original taint, will he say that it can enter heaven though it has never been purified by it? Let him answer this question.

He quotes Acts ii. 38, 39, and then asks, Could the minds of the hearers "fail, on such an occasion, to go back to the promise of the covenant of their fathers?" In which case, said he, "there is but one sense in which they could understand the designation 'your children.'" Now, mark the assumption, gentlemen: "If they did so understand the words, they must have conceived of them as *assuming* and intimating the continuance of the same connexion." But, gentlemen, we have conclusive evidence that they did not so understand them; for it is said in the context, "they that gladly received his word were baptized," and not a word is said of their children being baptized with them. He informed you that Peter's sermon was "the very beginning of the gospel." But where did he obtain his information? Not from the Will: for, according to the Evangelist Mark, "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ" was upwards of thirty years previous to Peter's sermon. Thus, according to this part of his evidence, the teachings and the examples of John and the Testator had become a dead letter.

We now come, gentlemen, to the Eighth Witness; and you must have observed, that neither he nor any other of the Witnesses gave any proof of the Testator asking the parents who brought the children if they themselves were believers. It appears they were brought promiscuously. Yes, but the Plaintiffs reply, "the very act of bringing them shows that they were believers." Nothing of the sort, gentlemen. It is but fair to infer, that, from having witnessed the Saviour's miracles and the cures that he had performed, they *believed* that he had power to perform similar cures on their children.* But this is a very different thing from "believing to the saving of the soul." As our Lord said, in another place, "Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of

* See Mark x. 13; Luke vi. 17.

the loaves, and were filled."* See also the instance of the ten lepers.†

The Testator was not speaking to the child which he held in his arms, but to his disciples, when he said, "Whosoever shall give *you* a cup of water, ... because you belong to Christ, ... shall not lose his reward."‡ See also the same language in Matthew x. 40—42, where there is no mention whatever of children in years. There the little ones are clearly shown to be his disciples; and it is when speaking of them that he says, "Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of *these little ones* a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, ...shall in no wise lose his reward." The conclusion drawn by this Witness from these words is, consequently, erroneous and inconclusive. Why did he not, when quoting Mark ix. 41, go on to the forty-second verse? Why? Because that verse would have overthrown his statement. It says, "Whosoever shall offend one of these little ones *that believe in me*,"—the same characters as those mentioned in the preceding verse,—"better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea." And why did he quote Matt. x. 41, 42, in preference to Mark? Because little ones were not mentioned in verse 41; but there are prophets mentioned, which is a word of similar import.

The remarks which this Witness makes on Romans v. 12. 18, 19, show, that, if infants suffer no more from Adam's transgression than being subject to "the common death," they are free both from actual and imputed sin. All, therefore, that die in innocency must, as a necessary consequence, through the death and resurrection of Christ, be raised in innocency, "and come again from the land of the enemy ...to their own border."§ While, by his remark on Psalm li. 5, he further shows, that children were born into the world pure, seeing that he believes the allusion of this verse to be to the bitter sorrows of conception and bringing forth. His brother, also, and a chief among his sect, shows the same thing. He says, that "the mind of a child is white paper,"‖ *i. e.*, unspotted. We are at a loss to understand, then, what it has either to be justified or absolved from. And does not my learned friend corroborate the same view, when he says, "a parent receives his child a perfect blank, a mere *rasa tabula*, as to any guilt actually contracted by him, and consequently may write upon him what he pleases."

* John vi. 26. † Luke xvii. 12—19. ‡ Mark ix. 41. § Jer. xxxi. 16, 17.
‖ Matthew Henry. See his Exposition on the Scriptures, Mark x. 15.

If this Witness, and all those who christen infants, would only leave them in the hands of their Creator, whose attributes are justice and love, and not attempt to dive into things which he hath not seen good to reveal, controversy on this subject would be unknown, and the irreverent manner of speaking of the Testator would be avoided. But how is it possible, gentlemen, that the baptismal water, as he calls it, can be either the token or emblem of either the giving or the receiving of the Spirit of life? Is there any proof of difference, in conduct or conversation, between the christened and the unchristened which survive? No. Who, then, can prove that there is any difference between those that die? He that imagines there is any virtue in the water, or any virtue communicated by the act of sprinkling or affusing, and acts upon that imagination, is a bold man. He usurps the seat of judgment, and arbitrarily makes a difference in children, when the Almighty makes none; for he has said, that an infant can no otherwise stand in relation to Christ "than by being solemnly devoted to him." Job asks, when declaring God's dealings with his servants, "Did not he that made me in the womb make him? and did not one fashion us in the womb? Or, did he not fashion us in one womb?"*

Why, gentlemen, the semi-civilized Chinese are, in their generation, wiser than these Witnesses, respecting all children being born free from sin; for, in the Annual Report of the Morrison Education Society, we find the following:—"The first book put into the hands of a child in this country, is a poetical work, in which verse consists of words or monosyllables.... But observe the tenor of the first few lines of this book, and you will see still more reason to refuse it a place among our means of instruction. It runs thus:—'Man's nature, at his birth, is virtuous. All are alike in this respect; but subsequent action makes the difference that we see; for if a man be not instructed, his original virtue becomes corrupted." And is not this something similar to what Paul wrote to the Ephesians, ii. 1—3?

The Ninth Witness said, "The humility and docility of the true disciples corresponded with the same dispositions in a young child." Now, if he allows that the apostles were true disciples, he must allow that his evidence is not in accordance with the text; for it was solely because they did *not* correspond that the Testator took the opportunity of holding up a child as an example of what their

* Margin, Job xxxi. 15.

dispositions ought to be. For at that time "there arose a reasoning among them, which of them should be greatest;"* when, according to Matthew, (which it did not suit this Witness to quote,) he called *a* little child to him,—one that might have been near to him,—and set him in the midst of them, and said, "Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven; and whosoever shall receive one such little child in my name, receiveth me: but whoso shall offend *one of these little ones* which BELIEVE IN ME, it were better,"† &c. Here, then, we have the true scriptural definition of the term LITTLE ONES—a term synonymous with believers in Christ. This definition, gentlemen, must for ever quash any attempt to invalidate its true meaning.

This Witness further said, that the Testator "manifestly glances at the church relationship of children to him." Manifestly glances! mark, gentlemen. Why the Testator describes the characters who stand in relationship to him in the plainest possible terms, when he says, "Whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."‡ None, therefore, who are incapable of doing the will of the Father can possibly stand in church relationship with him.

Again, he accuses us of evasive criticisms; but after the remarks I have submitted to you, you will be at no loss to determine against which party the accusation lies. Nay, the evidence of these Witnesses, and of the Ninth beyond any other of them, has been a tissue of evasions, assumptions, twistings, and turnings. Here he asserts that "the reason for children being permitted to come, must be found in themselves;" but in the early part of his evidence he told you he came here to prove that it was "the infant children of believing parents that are entitled to be made parties to the covenant of grace, by the act of their parents and the administration of baptism." Again, he gladly admits that all children dying before actual sin committed, are admitted into heaven. Then he turns round, and asserts that "none can enter into heaven ... who do not stand in a vital relation to him [Christ] as members of his mystical body; of which membership baptism is the initiatory rite." If he makes the latter statement the foundation of his creed, he exposes himself to the accusation of his brother, the First Witness, as being

* Luke ix. 46. † Matt. xviii. 2—6. ‡ Matt. xii. 50.

a disciple of Moloch; while if the former, he shows christening an infant to be an act of supererogation, a useless rite, "a mischievous device." But what can you expect, gentlemen, but prevarication, from those who come into this Court predetermined to uphold a doctrine which they must be assured, and that on scriptural grounds, cannot be upheld, and in which attempt this Witness, and two of the others who preceded him, do not scruple to denominate the expression of the Testator absurd?

Gentlemen, all who are "taught by him (Christ) as the truth is in Jesus,"* must believe that the innocent cannot come under condemnation, God being *just;* and that they cannot fail of being eternally happy, God being *love.* In what their happiness will consist, or where will be the place of their habitation, the Will nowhere reveals. But it is our duty to proclaim, because we have the Testator's authority to proclaim it, that "he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved," and reign with him in eternal glory. The believer, gentlemen, after he is baptized, grows, or should grow, "in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."† While, according to these Witnesses' own confession, the christened child, if it live, retrogrades until the time that it knows good from evil, and then is often lost. Behold, then, gentlemen, the mighty difference between the teaching of the Testator and the teaching of man!

Again, says this Witness, "the child the Testator took in his arms stood to him, by virtue of its circumcision, as a member of his Old Testament Church." Well, even if it were so, the children of Israel as a body stood to him only as a type of his true church. Consequently the child, by virtue of its circumcision, could only stand as a type of a true member of it. He would have been right in saying,—if he had applied his saying rightly,—that "this relation must exist on earth, before it can exist in heaven; or else we assign the work of sanctifying the fallen nature of man to a future state, which is contrary to the scriptures;" for, gentlemen, no individual can now stand in a vital relation to Christ, who has not been, on a genuine confession of faith, "baptized with water," and with the Holy Ghost.‡

* Eph. iv. 21. † Eph. iv. 13. ‡ Matt. xii. 50; Acts i. 5. 11. 16, 17; Acts xix. 4. 6; John iii. 5.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON 1 COR. VII. 14.

"FOR THE UNBELIEVING HUSBAND IS SANCTIFIED BY THE WIFE, AND THE UNBELIEVING WIFE IS SANCTIFIED BY THE HUSBAND; ELSE WERE YOUR CHILDREN UNCLEAN; BUT NOW ARE THEY HOLY."

The FIRST WITNESS said, "'The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife,' or rather, is to be *reputed* as sanctified, on account of his wife, she being a *christian* woman, and he, though a HEATHEN, being by marriage *one flesh* with her; her sanctity, as far as it refers to outward things, may be considered as imputed to him, so as to render their connexion not *unlawful*. The case is the same when the wife is a *heathen*, and the husband a *christian*. The word sanctification here is to be applied much more to the *christian* state, than to any moral change in the persons....The heathens in question were considered to be in this holy state, by means of their connexion with those who were by their christian profession *saints*.

"'Else were your children unclean.' If this kind of relative sanctification were not allowed, the children of those persons could not be received into the christian church, nor enjoy any rights or privileges as *christians;* but the church of God never scrupled to admit such children as members, just as well as she did those who had sprung from parents both of whom were christians. The Jews considered a child as born *out of holiness*, whose parents were not proselytes at the time of their birth, though afterwards they became proselytes. On the other hand, they considered the children of heathens born *in holiness*, provided the parents became proselytes before their birth."

The SECOND WITNESS said; "The apostle Paul resolves the case that 'the husband and wife ought, according to the intent and end of marriage, to cohabit and dwell together, and he assigns the reason for it, because the unbelieving, or infidel wife is sanctified to the believing, or christian husband. How sanctified? Not in her nature, but in her use, so that they might lawfully cohabit and

converse together, being by marriage made one flesh with him or her that is holy: 'and for your children,' says he, they are not seminally unclean, like the children of the heathen, but federally holy. How are they holy? Not with an inherent, internal, personal holiness,—for the holiest man's child is born in sin, and by nature a child of wrath,—but with an external, relative, and federal holiness; they are not common and unclean, like the children of infidels, but fit to be partakers of the privileges of the church, to be admitted into covenant with God, as belonging to his holy people. 'Else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.' He does not say, Else were your children bastards, but now are they legitimate, as the enemies of infant baptism, those *duri infantum patres*, would make him speak; but *else were they unclean*, *i. e.*, heathen children, not to be owned as a holy seed, and therefore not to be admitted into the covenant of God, as belonging to his holy people.* ...Though the word holy be used above five hundred times (in the New Testament), yet it never once signifies legitimacy, but is always used for a state of separation to God; therefore to make it signify so here, is a bold practising upon scripture, a wracking and wresting of the word of God to maintain a private opinion, to make the text speak what they would have, and not what the apostle intends. But the argument for infant baptism from this text runs thus; If the holy seed among the Jews were therefore to be circumcised, and made federally holy, by receiving the sign of the covenant, and being admitted into the number of God's holy people, because they were seminally holy, for *the root being holy, the branches were also holy*, then, by like reason, the holy seed of christians ought to be admitted to baptism, and receive the sign of the christian covenant, the laver of regeneration, and so be entered into the society of the christian church."†

The Fourth Witness said, "The unbelieving husband or wife was 'sanctified' to the believer, by the appointment and command of God, so that their marriage was holy and honourable. If this had not been so appointed, and if christians had been commanded to put away their unbelieving partners, as the Jews did their idolatrous wives, the children of such marriages would have been accounted relatively 'unclean,' and so excluded from baptism, even as those of the Jews in the above-mentioned case were from circum-

* Page 562. † Page 563.

cision; but on the contrary, they were accounted holy in the christian churches, and thus admitted among them as a part of the visible kingdom of God.... Something more must be meant by the believer 'sanctifying' the unbelieving party, than merely legalizing their marriage, for that would have been valid and lawful if both had been unbelievers, and the children could not *really* be more 'holy' in respect of their nature, if one parent was a believer, than if both were unbelievers. But as the word 'unclean' is frequently used in a relative sense, denoting *unfit to be admitted into God's ordinances*, and 'holy' the contrary, as in this sense the male children of the Jews, were 'holy,' and so partakers of circumcision, while those of the Gentiles, and even such as had one idolatrous parent, were *unclean*, and excluded from circumcision. I cannot but conclude, after long attention to the subject, that the baptism of the infant offspring of christians is here evidently referred to, as at that time customary in the churches, and that the Corinthians knew that this was not objected to when only one parent was a christian. Hence, then, the argument for infant baptism runs thus: If the holy seed among the Jews was therefore to be circumcised, and to be made *federally* holy by receiving the sign of the covenant, and being admitted into the number of God's holy people, because they were born in sanctity, or were *seminally* holy, 'for the root being holy, so are the branches also;' then, by like reason, the holy seed of christians ought to be admitted to baptism, and receive the sign of the christian covenant, 'the laver of regeneration,' and so be entered into the society of the Christian Church."*

The Fifth Witness said, "The word unclean, in almost all instances in the scriptures, denotes *that which may not be offered to God, or may not come into his temple.* Of this character were the heathen universally, and they were therefore customarily and proverbially denominated unclean by the *Jews.* The unbelievers here spoken of were heathen, and were therefore unclean. In this sense the children born of *two heathen parents* are here pronounced to be unclean also, as being in the proper sense heathen. *To be holy*, as here used, is the converse of being unclean, and denotes *that which may be offered to God. To be sanctified*, as referring to the objects here mentioned, *is to be separated for religious purposes, consecrated to God*, as were the first-born, and vessels of the temple; or *to be in*

* 1 Cor. vii. 12—14.

a proper condition to appear before God. In this text it denotes that the unbelieving parent is so purified by means of his relation to the believing parent, that their mutual offspring are not unclean, but may be offered to God. There is no other sense in which *a Jew* could have written this text, without some qualification of these words."*

The EIGHTH WITNESS said, "Several of the Corinthian converts, having unbelieving yoke-fellows, doubted of the lawfulness of cohabiting with them, and seemed to think themselves obliged to separate, lest the offspring of such unequal marriages should be deemed impure, and unmeet to be taken into covenant with God. This their doubt seemed to be just, and to carry in it great weight, being grounded on the known conduct of Ezra and the Jewish elders, in a parallel case.† But the apostle resolves it, by telling them that 'the unbelieving yoke-fellow was so far sanctified by (or to, or because of,) the believing, as that their children, which would otherwise be unclean, are now holy.' Here, then, we see a most clear and evident distinction made betwixt the children of believers and the children of infidels; the one are *unclean*, *i. e.*, do not stand in any visible covenant relation to Jehovah; and the other are *holy*, *i. e.*, in the same sense holy as the Jews were an holy nation, taken into a peculiar relation with God.

"This sentiment of an infant's holiness, and of the propriety and duty of its being brought into the Church of God, and there solemnly devoted to him, was quite scriptural and rational, as well as perfectly agreeable to the appointed customs, and forms, and languages of those times. For in Luke‡ it is said, they brought the infant Jesus to the temple, to present him to the Lord: as it is written in the law, 'Every first-born male shall be holy unto the Lord.' Hence it plainly follows, 1, That infants are capable of holiness, and that some were accounted holy, (*i. e.*, taken into a more peculiar relation to God,) whilst others were not. And, 2. That our Lord himself, when an infant, passed under a sacred ceremony, of the same nature with our infants when we bring them to be baptized. The infant Jesus, like ours, was brought to the place of worship, there solemnly to be presented, or devoted, to the Lord.

"These several scriptures being impartially weighed, the propriety and fitness of bringing children to baptism seems to be established

* Vol. ii. page 536. † See Ezra x. 1—3. ‡ Luke ii. 22, 23.

beyond all rational doubt. As a conclusion to this argument, I beg leave to ask, Must not the christian dispensation be allowed in all things to have the preference, and to be better than the Jewish? But if it excludes our infants from the covenant of God, and from standing in any federal relation to Heaven, then here is one, and that a very important and considerable, instance in which it is vastly inferior. Now had this really been the case, how mighty and just a prejudice would it have raised in the Jews against christianity! What complaints and objections should we doubtless have heard them making against this new dispensation, and casting their children out of God's covenant, and putting them on a level with those of infidels and pagans! But as, amongst their many and loud cavils at the religion of Christ, and the continued oppositions and reproaches of the Judaizers, we find not the least shadow of a complaint of this kind, it may with great assurance be concluded that there was no such occasion given, but that christianity, as it found, so it continued and confirmed, the infants of good men in the covenant of God.*...

"Let the scriptures then interpret themselves, and one part of the divine dispensation be suffered to explain the other, (of which other it was intended to be a figure or type,) and we shall find it perfectly agreeable to the analogy and style of scripture, as well as to the reason of things, that infants should be admitted as members of the Christian Church, and are therefore included in the commission to baptize."†

Gentlemen, said the Counsel for the Defendants, before I comment on the evidence which you have just heard, allow me to trespass upon your patience while I point out to you the awful judgments that were visited on the Lord's people, in consequence of their intermarrying with the people of the world. These awful judgments might very naturally have prompted the believing Corinthians to put the question to Paul which brought forth the answer now under consideration.

It was this intermarrying that was one principal cause of the destruction of the old world. "The sons of God saw the daughters

* Pages 35—37. † Page 39.

of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all whom they chose. And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh, yet his days shall be a hundred and twenty years."* At the end of which period, "all flesh" was destroyed, save what the ark contained. From this we may gather, what was indeed a natural consequence of these intermarriages, that the rising generations became idolaters, — in other words, false worshippers,— until there was only one righteous man remaining on the whole earth. "Take good heed, therefore, to yourselves," was Joshua's last charge to the people of God, "that ye love the Lord your God. Else, if ye do in any wise go back, and cleave unto the remnant of the nations, even these that remain among you, and shall make marriages with them, and go in unto them, and they to you, know for a certainty that the Lord your God will no more drive out any of these nations from before you; but they shall be snares and traps unto you, and scourges in your sides, and thorns in your eyes, until ye perish from off this good land, which the Lord your God has given you."†

Absalom was the son of Maacha, a "strange woman," the daughter of Talma, king of Geshur;‡ he rebelled against king David, his father, and was "a thorn in his eyes" so long as he lived, and a great source of grief to him afterwards. "Solomon loved many strange women, together with the daughter of Pharaoh, women of the Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, Gidonians, and Hittites; of the nations concerning which the Lord said unto the children of Israel, Ye shall not go in unto them, neither shall they come in unto you, for surely they will turn away your heart after their gods. ...and the Lord was angry with Solomon, because his heart was turned from the Lord God of Israel, which had appeared unto him twice, and had commanded him concerning this thing, that he should not go after other gods; but he kept not that which the Lord commanded; wherefore, the Lord said unto Solomon, Forasmuch as this is done of thee, and thou hast not kept my covenant and my statutes which I have commanded thee; I will surely rend the kingdom from thee, and will give it to thy servant."§ Immediately after the death of Solomon, the threatening was fulfilled, and ten out of the twelve tribes revolted, and became idolaters.

Rehoboam, also, was the son of a strange woman, an Ammonitess;

* Gen. vi. 2, 3. † Joshua xxiii. 11. 13; see also Deut. vii. 3, 4.
‡ 2 Sam. iii. 3. § 1 Kings xi. 1—11.

"and Judah did evil in the sight of the Lord, and they provoked him to jealousy with their sins which they had committed, above all that their fathers had done. For they also built them high places, and images, and groves on every high hill, and under every green tree." And "Shishak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem, and he took away the treasures of the house of the Lord;...he even took away all."* Thus was the temple, after having been built only about thirty-eight years, sacked; that temple which, for its grandeur, and being the place where the Lord was consulted in behalf of his people, was denominated "the Beauty of Holiness." Then, in the Book of Numbers, it is said, "The people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab;" the penalty for which was, the death of twenty-four thousand of the Israelites. But Phineas, by slaying Zimri, an Israelitish prince, and Cozbi, a Midianitish woman of rank, stayed the plague, and turned the wrath of the Lord from the children of Israel; and because he was zealous for his God, he had given to him the covenant of an everlasting priesthood.†

Ezra knew the sin to be so great, that he saw no other way of turning the wrath of God from the people than by dissolving all the strange marriages, and putting away the children that were born of them.‡

Malachi says, "Judah hath profaned the holiness of the Lord which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god."§

Seeing, then, that the breach of this law has been a principal cause of the temporal and eternal death of a whole world, save eight persons, and that of the far greater portion of the Jewish family; and, judging from the laxity of five out of the seven churches of Asia, has been a principal means of hiding the true light from the greatest part of the earth; for that which is mentioned in Rev. ii. 14, of the doctrine of Balaam, may have allusion to the daughters of Moab seducing Israel to sin,‖ and that which is mentioned of Jezebel in Rev. ii. 20, to 1 Kings xvi. 31. 33, and xviii. 4; the same cause may eventually greatly tend to clothe the whole of it with darkness. We cannot then, gentlemen, scripturally presume, that any believer can now infringe this law and be held guiltless.

Some persons may, and no doubt do, endeavour to excuse themselves, by imagining that this may be a means of converting the

* 1 Kings xiv. 21—26. † Numb. xxv. 1—9. ‡ Ezra x. 3.
§ Mal. ii. 11. ‖ Num. xxxi. 15, 16.

unbelieving persons they are about to marry; but the result is generally the contrary, and must, as a natural consequence, be so, since conduct like this is to fly in the face of God. This may be illustrated by the question put to the priests by Haggai—"If one bear holy flesh in the skirt of his garment, and with his skirt do touch bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil, or any meat, shall it be holy? And the priest said, ... No. Then said Haggai, If one that is unclean by a dead body touch any of these, shall it be unclean? And the priests said,...It shall be unclean."*

Gentlemen, it is contrary to the tenor of the Will, to suppose that the calling of the one party can confer any sanctification on the other. The marriage contract, previously entered into, was not dissolved by it; and therefore in that sense, and in that alone, the unbeliever was sanctified to continue in the marriage relationship with the believer; else were their children unclean: but this uncleanness of the children is stated to be a consequence of the supposed unlawfulness of the unbeliever continuing to live with the believer, and must necessarily signify illegitimacy; for though they were begotten in marriage, yet, upon the supposition that the calling of one parent by the gospel dissolved the union, they must, in consequence, have been an unlawful issue. Seeing, therefore, that the unbelieving party was holy only in respect of being a lawful husband or wife to the believing one, I see not what holiness the children could have, beyond that of being a lawful issue. Surely, then, this affords no argument in favour of christening infants. Certainly the apostle could not have expressed himself in a clearer manner, unless he had accommodated his language more to the understanding of the Plaintiffs, and substituted the words, "bastard" for "unclean," and "lawful" for "holy." The apostle, so far from making any difference in children, declares that "God hath made of one blood all nations of men," and that "there is no difference between the Jew and the Gentile."† Consequently there can be no difference, in their offspring, while they remain in an infantile state.

In answer to some question that had been proposed by the Corinthians, respecting marriage, the apostle Paul says, that "it is good for the present distress ... for a man so to be," (unmarried:) and to the unmarried and widows he says, "It is good for them if they abide even as I." Although he gave this advice, it was not that he disapproved of believers marrying at all, but at that par-

* Hag. ii. 12, 13. † Acts xvii. 26; Rom. x. 12.

ticular season, a season of great persecution. But even then, it was not to affect those who had been already married: those he admonishes to remain as they were. Whatever state a believer was in when called, he was to use no unlawful means to change it. "Art thou called being a servant, care not for it."* "Is any called in uncircumcision, let him not become circumcised." The Corinthians had no doubt that the marriage of unbelievers was legal. Their doubt respected its legality in the event of one of them being called of God after being married; and they wished to know whether that circumstance would require them to separate. Paul informs them it would not, for then would their children be unclean, but "now," says he, "they are holy," or legitimate, in contradistinction to unclean. Paul shows, also, that one being called was an advantage, as it might be a means in the hands of God of saving the other. But this does not imply the least permission for the unmarried believer to make the experiment.

Every Jew was commanded to circumcise his child. I do not recollect that we read of any exception, save for the time when the Israelites were in the wilderness; nor of infants, under any circumstances being reckoned ceremonially unclean; nor of any being reckoned exclusively holy, except "the male that opened the matrix;"† these only were presented to the Lord.

The New Testament, gentlemen, gives no instructions, either directly or indirectly, respecting infants; whatever meaning, therefore, may attach to the term "holy," in the passage before us, it can have no allusion to their fitness or unfitness for baptism. If, as the Plaintiff's Witnesses pretend, the rite of christening succeeded to that of circumcision, and ought therefore to be administered to the same subjects as circumcision was of old, (which subjects were, *every one* "*born in the house*, or *bought with money* of any stranger.")‡ Surely it is very inconsistent in them, at the same time to argue that it ought to be administered to the children of believing parents only, or at most to children one of whose parents was a believer; for it is a well-known fact, that a very small portion of the ancient Jews came under this description. Further, gentlemen, how does it happen that the majority of the Witnesses act contrary to their professed principles, and christen every child that is brought to them for that purpose, although, in numberless

* 1 Cor. vii. 21. † Luke ii. 23. ‡ Gen. xvii. 12.

cases, they neither know nor enquire whether its parents be Jews, infidels, or even nominal christians?

We have no evidence, gentlemen, that the question put by the Corinthians to Paul had the slightest reference to their children. They were desirous to know how they themselves, as believers, stood in the eyes of their heavenly Father. Whence Paul, to satisfy them on the subject, answered, that if one of them, being called, dissolved the marriage, their children would be illegitimate; but as it did not, their children were holy, *i. e.*, ceremonially so, as all the progeny of the Jews were who had married according to the commandment. But this was not the case in the time of Ezra. Then the holy seed, contrary to the command of God, "mingled themselves with the people of those lands;"* in consequence of which, their marriage was made void, and the children of course were illegitimate. There is no similarity in the two cases; the marriages of the Corinthians, under the circumstances, were legal; those of the idolatrous Jews were illegal.

As there were only two descriptions of people under the old dispensation, Jews and Gentiles; so there are only two under the new, believers and unbelievers. If then, gentlemen, the law was so strict as to forbid the intermarriage of a Jew, who was only ceremonially holy, with a Heathen, analogy would teach us, in the absence of all other grounds on which we could form our judgment, that the gospel forbids a believer, one who is positively holy, from marrying with an unbeliever. If one was the means of corrupting his worship, must not the other be far more so? The line of demarcation is now as plain, and the difference between the sons of God and the children of men as great, as it was between the children of Seth and the children of Canaan; or as between the Jews and the Heathens. There can be no intermediate degree between the two; a person must either be a believer or an unbeliever. A genuine confession of faith in the ordinance of baptism, is the only manifest line that divides them.† On one side or the other of this line, according to the scriptures, all stand; and although many undoubtedly make a spurious profession, and place themselves in a worse situation than they were in before, this does not militate against my statement; for we have no other scriptural criterion by which to judge when a person is buried with Christ into death,

* Ezra ix. 2. † Mark xvi. 16; John iii. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27.

and raised up from the dead to walk in newness of life,* than the time of his baptism.

But, gentlemen, have we not full instructions on this head in the gospel? The apostle Paul says, "Know ye not that your body is the temple of Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price, therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's."† And as his epistles are addressed only to the saints in Christ Jesus, all directions which he gives respecting marriage must of necessity relate solely to marriages with each other. "And many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized."‡ It was the baptized who were anxious to know if their being "joined to the Lord" affected their union with their unbelieving yoke-fellows; and the apostle assured them that it did not, seeing that they had entered into that union previous to their being called of God.

The apostle asks, "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what concord hath light with darkness?" Here, gentlemen, it is clearly shown, that in the sight of God there are only two classes of people on the earth—the righteous and the unrighteous; those who are brought to see the light, and those who remain in darkness. And as there is "no concord betwixt Christ and Belial," so "he that believeth hath no part with an infidel," (or unbeliever.) Again he asks, "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" Seeing then that believers "are the temple of the living God," what agreement can they have with idols? "Be ye not," saith the apostle, "unequally yoked together.... Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."§ Seeing then that believers are commanded not to mix with the world, how much more careful ought they to be not to form a close and inseparable connexion with it. The command to separate from the world was positive to the believing Corinthians, and through them to every believer then living, to all that have since lived, and to all that ever shall live. Speaking of a widow, the apostle says, "she is at liberty to marry to whom she will, only in the Lord."‖ In the 8th verse of the same chapter, he says, "I say therefore to the unmarried (including both sexes,) and widows,

* Rom. vi. 4. † 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. ‡ Acts xviii. 8.
§ 2 Cor. vi. 14—18. ‖ 1 Cor. vii. 39.

it is good for them to abide as I am." From this text, and the tenor of all that is said on the marriage of believers, the law is general, to marry "only in the Lord."

And, gentlemen, seeing that the servant, and more especially the minister, of God, is not to be "conformed to this world,"* because his first and paramount duty is the service of his God;† and as he can have no concord with it, does it not follow, as "evil communications corrupt good manners,"‡ that he is not to mix with it further than the common courtesies of society demand? For if he does, he must conceal his own sentiments, and hearken to conversation derogatory to his profession. Neither ought he to form any connexion with it; nor partake of its sports, its entertainments, or diversions; nor to follow its fashions; nor pursue his worldly calling, so as to allow it to engross his best attention, or to disturb the serenity of his mind. "I would," says the apostle, "have you without carefulness."§ "For no man," says he, "that warreth, entangleth himself with the affairs of this life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier."‖ And as the believer is commanded not to be the servant of men,¶ but to "come out from among them, and be separate;"** and as he is told that "the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations;"†† and also that "the friendship of the world is enmity with God;"‡‡ is it not, therefore, manifest, that he ought not, from choice, to accept of any honorary civil office; because, as a natural consequence, it must lead him into society which will be hurtful to him, and of no advantage to it?§§ It is said. "Let the potsherd strive with the potsherds of the earth."‖‖ Besides, it might also cause in him a baneful desire to become distinguished among the men of the world, to the great detriment of his high character, as "heir of God, and joint heir with Christ."¶¶ "Can one go upon hot coals, and his feet not be burned?"*** He has the example of his Lord and Master, who said, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight;"††† and, when appealed to on a worldly subject, replied, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?"‡‡‡ The example of the apostles, also, is to the point: so far as we know, they never interfered in earthly things; while Paul exhorted the Corinthians thus,

* Rom. xii. 2.
† Matt. vi. 24—33.
‡ 1 Cor. xv. 33.
§ 1 Cor. vii. 32.
‖ 2 Tim. ii. 4.
¶ 1 Cor. vii. 23.
** 2 Cor. vi. 17.
†† Num. xxiii. 9.
‡‡ James iv. 4.
§§ Hag. ii. 12, 13.
‖‖ Isa. xlv. 9.
¶¶ Rom. viii. 17.
*** Prov. vi. 28.
††† John xviii. 36.
‡‡‡ Luke xii. 14.

"Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ."* If, then, as a believer must, after the example of the Lord and his apostles, avoid all unnecessary connexion with men of the world, which may be a stumbling block in the way of attending "upon the Lord without distraction,"† how much more is he to avoid a connexion the closest of all others? The high-born of this country are generally above intermarrying with those beneath them, lest they should lower themselves in the eyes of their equals. How much more, then, should the children, the heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, be above intermarrying with the children of men, and thus lower themselves in the eyes of their God; being sensible that, if they should so intermarry, they would offend their heavenly Father. And although they may not be disinherited by the act, of which there is danger,‡ they are sure, sooner or later, while here below, to pay the penalty due to their offence. He forgiveth his people, though he taketh "vengeance of their inventions."§

But I am digressing, gentlemen; and yet, I trust you will allow the magnitude of the subject to plead my excuse, and afford me your further attention, while I canvass the evidence of the Witnesses upon it. They have adopted the dogma of infant christening, handed down to them by their forefathers, and therefore assume it to be scriptural. They cling to, and combat for it, as if it were commanded of God; and, in the vain endeavour to maintain it, seize on irrelevant passages, lay them down on a procrustean bed, and apply the torture until they stretch or contract them to their own preconceived standard. And thus, gentlemen, it will ever be, "while tradition and deep-rooted prejudices are substituted for the teaching of the gospel."

The First Witness informed you, that if this relative sanctification were not allowed, the children of those persons would not be received into the christian church. But, as neither he nor any of the other Witnesses has given, from the Will, the least semblance of proof that infants were at any time admitted into it, you must blot from your remembrance this part of his evidence.

You will recollect, gentlemen, that the Second Witness, who now informs you that "the children of such persons are not common nor unclean, like the children of infidels, but fit to be partakers of the privileges of the church," is the Witness who previously accused the Jews

* 1 Cor. xi. 1; See also 1 Cor. ii. 2, Gal. vi. 14, Phil. iii. 8.
† 1 Cor. vii. 35. ‡ 1 Tim. v. 11, 12. § Ps. xcix. 8.

of "*bragging* of their natural birth, or descent from Abraham, as being of his blood and offspring;" and who asserted, that "men became not the children of God by natural propagation," and that "no external privilege or prerogative whatever, without faith in Christ, is in any *whit available to salvation.*" It is very incongruous, then, in him, to apply the epithet "unfeeling" to us, because we assert that all who die in infancy, and all who have lived and died in a state of imbecility, never having known good from evil, whether born of christian or infidel parents, will, independent of the help of man, be alike eternally happy. He ought, rather, to apply the term to himself; for, according to his own statement, he consigns not only the unchristened but the christened to perdition; at least, nothing less than this can be inferred from his evidence.

You will also recollect, that he told you the holiest man's child was born in sin, and by nature a child of wrath. Thus he implies that all are so born; and, consequently, that all are answerable for Adam's transgression. But you will recollect, also, that my learned friend, when endeavouring to prove the doctrine of original sin, knew better than to bring forward Ephes. ii. 3, in proof of it. He was, doubtless, aware that the word "nature," in that text, did not support the idea that men are born children of wrath, but that they make themselves so, by walking "according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience."

Jewish children, gentlemen, after the manner of their parents, were accounted holy. As a nation they were chosen of God to be a special people unto himself.* But then, their being so accounted was only typical of what the actual people of God should be, and now are. The true root being the Lord of glory, none can be reckoned the true branches but those that the hand of the great Husbandman causes to shoot from that root; *i. e.*, those who, speaking without a figure, are baptized, after making a genuine confession of their sins, and a profession of faith in Christ.†

The Fourth Witness acknowledges, that the children would not really be more holy, on account of one parent being a believer, than if both had been unbelievers; but he says the word unclean is frequently used in a relative sense, denoting *unfitness to be admitted to God's ordinances.* True, gentlemen, it is so; but then, in that

* Deut. vii. 6. † See Matt. iii. 6, and x. 32; Mark xvi. 16; Acts ii. 38—41; viii. 37; 1 John ii. 5, and v. 3.

relative sense, it was employed in respect of some disease or infirmity, or some personal act; never with respect to the state of a child as it comes into the world. The legitimate analogical assumption is, that Paul had no other meaning, when he used the word in this clause, than that, if the parents were separated, the children would be accounted spurious. If, as this Witness "cannot but conclude, after long attention to the subject, that the baptism of the infant offspring of christians is here evidently referred to," why does he not assert it boldly, and not remain, according to his previous confession, in any trouble "about it"?

In answer to the Fifth Witness, and in opposition to his evidence, we maintain, that the word unclean, in almost every instance, denotes either that which may not be eaten, or that which defiles either a person or thing by coming in contact with it. As I before observed, the word is never applied to the new-born Israelitish males. All of them were commanded to be circumcised; there was no exception made, in the event of the parents turning idolaters, as the far greater portion of them did. The children of the holy, and the children of the unholy, were alike circumcised. He says, indeed, that to be holy, as here used, is the converse of being unclean; but he has not proved his assertion. Holy is generally used as the converse of being unholy, and clean as the converse of being unclean.* It appears that the question asked was, If an individual who had been called to the knowledge of the truth after marriage could continue to live with another who had not been so called. And the answer, being in the affirmative, naturally conveys the idea that the children, under that circumstance, were legitimate, else they must have been repudiated, and thus rendered illegitimate, as was the case in Ezra's day. And, gentlemen, you must recollect, as I have before noticed, that it was only the male that opened the womb that was particularly called holy,† as well that of man as that of beast; for the Lord sanctified the first born of both man and beast for himself.‡ According to the new dispensation, which does not regard the first born as they were regarded under the old, the Plaintiffs cannot establish their case. Neither, indeed, can they, according to the old dispensation: for, according to their own language, they offer to the Lord all the children of a family, without giving any preference to the first born; while they never offer either the first or the last born of beasts:

* See Lev. x. 10, xi. 47, xiv. 57; Deut. xii. 15, xv. 22; Eccles. ix. 2.
† Luke ii. 23. ‡ Num. viii. 17.

whereas, under the old dispensation, it was as imperative to offer the first born of beasts as the first born of man.

We were previously given to understand, that the Plaintiffs' leading precedent, or example, for christening infants, was taken from the rite of circumcision among the Jews; but they now change their ground, and tell you, according to the Eighth Witness, that "these several scriptures,* being impartially weighed, the propriety and fitness of bringing children to baptism seems to be established beyond all rational doubt." But how can this be, gentlemen? In the former text, there is nothing either said or implied, that children were the subjects of any rite; neither is there in the latter. Of this the Witness appears to be aware; because he is not satisfied even with his new position, seeing that it only SEEMS to establish his point. The Saviour of the world was presented to the Lord according to the law, in the same manner as was every other Jewish male that opened the womb. Now if the Plaintiffs take the law of purification for their precedent, they ought only to offer their first-born; and that only in the event of its being a male; and even then only on the forty-second day of its birth. If the law of circumcision, they ought to christen the males only, and those only on the eighth day; but in fact they blend together both dispensations, and follow neither.

Gentlemen, the Testator was circumcised, and presented to the Lord, in order that the old dispensation, which he came to abolish, might be fulfilled in him; and he was baptized when about thirty years of age, to "fulfil all righteousness," and to set an example by which all believers were thenceforth to follow him throughout the new dispensation which he came to establish. Well, then, according to this Witness even, the Christian dispensation is superior to that of the Jewish, and it might be inquired how it happens, notwithstanding both he and his constituents prefer the latter to the former, that they christen the child, instead of baptizing the man. This, is neither "rational," nor conformable to the precepts of the gospel. They neglect the man, and bestow all their attention on the child; as the Jews pretended to do when about to enter the promised land. "Wherefore (said they,) hath the Lord brought us into this land, to fall by the sword, that our wives and children should be a prey?" To which the Lord replied, by his servants Moses and Aaron, "*Your* carcases shall fall in this wilderness, and all that were numbered of

* 1 Cor. vii. 14, and Luke ii. 22, 23.

you,...from twenty years old and upward....But your *little ones*, which ye said should be a prey, them will I bring in, and they shall know the land which ye have despised. But as for you, your carcases, they shall fall in this wilderness."*—And who shall say that this may not be typical of what shall happen at the time of the rising again of the Witnesses?† Almost the whole world may now be typically regarded as marching through a wilderness; and, like the Israelites of old, they seem to be more mindful of their children's welfare, than that of their own. And may not the parent sinner (he who has *despised* the good land,) perish in it, while his offspring, by obeying the Will, shall inherit the land of gospel rest, the antitype of the land of Canaan?

This Witness told you, "that christianity, as it found, so it continued and confirmed, the infants of good men in the covenant of God." Christianity, gentlemen, found that the law made no difference with respect to infants, those of faithful Abraham, and those of his infidel servants, being alike circumcised; and so it left them as it found them, on a par. His cavils "at the religion of Christ," are as many and as loud as were those of the Jews; and his conduct quite as unscriptural, and far more inconsistent. He professes to see a most clear and evident distinction between the children of believers and the children of infidels, and yet he makes none; he puts the foundling of a prostitute, one born of the vilest of the vile, on a level with the child of what he calls a *good* man; and adds, that a child may become holy in this sense of the word, through the person that volunteers to stand godfather for it.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON 1 COR. X. 1, 2.

"MOREOVER, BRETHREN, I WOULD NOT THAT YE SHOULD BE IGNORANT HOW THAT ALL OUR FATHERS WERE UNDER THE CLOUD, AND ALL PASSED THROUGH THE SEA, AND WERE ALL BAPTIZED UNTO MOSES IN THE CLOUD AND IN THE SEA."

The FIRST WITNESS said, "Rather, *into Moses*, into the *covenant* of which Moses was the mediator, and by this typical baptism they

* Numb. xiv. 3. 29—32. † Rev. xi. 11—19.

were brought under the obligation of acting according to the Mosaic precepts; as christians, receiving christian baptism, are said to be baptized *into Christ*, and are thereby brought under obligation to keep the precepts of the gospel.*...

"It is manifest from scripture, that the miraculous cloud in the wilderness performed a threefold office to the Israelites:—1. It was a cloud in the form of a *pillar*, to direct their journeyings by *day*. 2. It was a pillar of *fire*, to give *light* to the camp by night. 3. It was a covering for them during the day, and preserved them from the scorching rays of the sun, and supplied them with a sufficiency of *aqueous particles*, not only to cool that burning atmosphere, but to give refreshment to themselves and their cattle; and its *humidity* was so abundant, that the apostle here represents the people as thoroughly sprinkled and enveloped in its aqueous vapours,†... for he represents the whole camp as being *sprinkled* or *immersed* in the humidity of its vapours, and expressly calls it a being *under the cloud*, and being *baptized* in the cloud."‡

The Second Witness said—"1. The Israelites are here said to be *baptized* in the cloud and in the sea; that is, the cloud which overshadowed them did sometimes bedew and sprinkle them, and the Red Sea, through which they passed, had its waters gathered into two heaps, one on the right hand, and the other on the left, betwixt which the Israelites passed, and in their passage seemed to be buried in the waters, as persons in that age were put under the water when they were baptized; and thus were Israel baptized in the cloud and in the sea. 2. They are said to be baptized *unto Moses* in the cloud and in the sea. *Unto* Moses, that is, *into* the doctrine taught by Moses, that they believed him, and followed his conduct through the sea, and were confirmed in their belief of Moses, the typical mediator, as a person employed by God, and were obliged, under the ministry and guidance of Moses, to follow God wheresoever he led them. 3. That all this was a figure, to which our baptism answers; both the cloud and the sea had some resemblance to our being covered with water in baptism, by which we are confirmed in the faith of Christ, and obliged to profess and own him, to trust in and depend upon him, to serve and obey him, and this to the death. Behold how much of Christ and his gospel

* 1 Cor. x. 2. † 1 Cor. x. 1. ‡ Exod. xiii. 21.

was shadowed and held forth to the Jews under the dispensation of the ceremonial law."*

The FOURTH WITNESS said, "The apostle would not have the christians at Corinth ignorant, how that all the fathers of the nations of Israel came out of Egypt under the guidance and protection of 'the cloud,' which gave them light by night, and was an overshadowing canopy to them by day; being an emblem of the Lord's providential care and gracious guidance of his people; and that the whole company was safely conducted through the Red Sea, in which the Egyptians were drowned. Thus they were initiated, as by baptism, into the true religion, under the instruction of Moses, the type of Christ, by the overshadowing cloud and by the waters of the sea; and the whole nation, men, women, and children, were acknowledged as the visible church of God, in a manner which resembled that by which professed christians were admitted into the church by baptism."†

The FIFTH WITNESS said, "In the whole of this story, it is evident there is no account whatever of that baptism of the ISRAELITES mentioned by *St. Paul* in this passage. There is not even an allusion to this baptism, unless it is in the declaration that '*the pillar of the cloud went from before the Israelites, and stood behind them.*' By the waters of the Red Sea they were not even sprinkled, much less immersed, but went, as *Moses* expressly informs us, between two walls of water, upon the dry ground. Neither is there here any account that 'they were baptized in *the cloud*,' whatever the phraseology may mean.

"But what *Moses* has omitted, *Asaph* has particularly recorded, in the 77th Psalm. In this account of the passage through the Red Sea, we have the baptism spoken of by St. Paul expressly mentioned, together with several other facts not recorded by the historian. *The clouds poured forth water* upon them, or descended upon them in rain, while they were journeying through the sea....There is reason to believe, from this declaration, that when the cloud passed from the van of the Israelites to the rear, or when, in the language of the Psalmist, 'they were poured forth' from before the Israelites to stand behind them, the rain may have descended from the cloud during the passage. Whether this be admitted or not,

* Page 572. † 1 Cor. x. 1—5.

it is clear that this is the only account of the baptism mentioned by *St. Paul* which is contained in the Old Testament, and it is equally clear that the baptism was a cleansing accomplished by the sprinkling of rain, and certainly not by immersion....Here then is one instance in which this word denotes cleansing by *sprinkling*, and not by immersion."*

The SEVENTH WITNESS said, "That there is nothing in the idea of being 'baptized' which should exclude infants, is evident from what Paul says of the children of Israel on their leaving Egypt, when we know that they had all their infants with them."†

The EIGHTH WITNESS said, "When the Israelites were called out from among the idolatrous Egyptians, and were sanctified and set apart as a *holy people*, a church of God, they *were all baptized;* the apostle says, by the *cloud* and by the *sea*—by the cloud *pouring down* water on them, and by the sea *sprinkling* them with its surges as they passed through.‡...As God sent a strong east wind to drive back and divide the waters, the same instrument was no doubt employed to continue them in this state. Now, by the mighty agitations into which the waters were cast by this violent repulsion, and the strong wind at the same time furiously blowing, it is easy to conceive the passing Israelites must be sprinkled with the spray of the tossing waves, and thus were baptized by it. Here, then, is another incontestable instance of a scriptural baptism without immersion. The Israelites are expressly said to *be baptized* in or by *the sea*, as well as by the cloud; yet no one will presume to say that they were buried or overwhelmed in it."§

The TENTH WITNESS said, "This is certainly a passage on which much stress has been laid; and this I acknowledge, that sea sounds well, and there would be at least water enough. But permit me to remark, if this was dipping, it was dry dipping, for we are told, Exod. xiv. 22, 29, that the children of Israel, on that occasion, 'went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground; and walked upon dry land, in the midst of the sea.' Now when our opponents dip in a dry baptistry, and the people walk in the midst of dry ground, this example will do; but not till then. Indeed, it is highly probable, from the great hosts of Israel which passed through the Red Sea,

* Vol. ii. page 543. † Page 189. ‡ Page 81. § Page 90.

that they occupied such a space of ground that many of them were not within a quarter of a mile of the watery walls, either on the right hand or on the left; and therefore how they could be plunged in the sea I leave sages to determine.

"But if Βαπτιζω here signifies immersion, they were also plunged in the cloud, and how this happened I cannot tell. The sacred historian says, the Lord went before them in a pillar of cloud by day, to lead them the way, and by night in a pillar of fire, to give them light; and on this occasion the pillar of the cloud went from before their faces, and stood behind them; but at what time the Israelites were above it, and plunged into it, he does not say; and yet, you know, nothing short of this will come up to the idea of dipping or immersion. I rather think that none of the Israelites were permitted to approach near this sacred symbol of the Divine presence, and much less to metamorphose it into a plunging place. ... But let us try their primary and most natural meaning of words, in translating the verse; perhaps this will make things better. Now, here is the Greek word Βαπτιζω, the primary and most natural meaning of which, according to the most eminent and learned authors of different countries, they say, is to immerse, to dip, to plunge. And here is the Greek preposition εις, which, they say, naturally expresses the idea of into. Translate the verse in this learned way, then, and it will read, 'And were all *plunged into Moses*, in the cloud, and in the sea.'

"Alas, gentlemen, we have all been in a mistake together. The passage says nothing, it seems, about plunging in the cloud and in the sea, but *into Moses;* and this was certainly a strange element. And were all plunged into Moses? Really, I pity the poor man. And yet, perhaps he is not less an object of pity, whose meaning of words makes Moses' body a baptistry for all the children of Israel. Nay, let me seriously ask you, if this primary and most natural meaning of words does not make some most eminent and learned authors of different countries appear to have strange head-pieces?"*

* Pages 14—16.

The Counsel for the Defendants here rose up, and said,

Gentlemen, notwithstanding the profane and irreverent manner of the last Witness might well justify another course, I shall endeavour to expose the erroneous views which have been submitted to you, by showing the typical bearing of this clause. Moses, doubtless, was a peculiar type of Christ. Speaking to the Israelites, who, as a body, were nothing more than a type of the true Israel, he said, "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken."* Moses was the instrument which, by the mighty power of God, delivered them from the bondage of their fellow men. Christ, the prophet foretold of, by his own power delivers us from the bondage of Satan. The Israelites were under the cloud, the symbol of God's presence; a guide and shade for them by day, and a light by night. We are under the immediate guidance of our great Commander;† who is our Leader by day, and a lamp to our feet by night. On their way to the promised land, the Israelites passed safely through the Red Sea; while the Egyptians, who would have obstructed their passage, perished in it. We, on the way to our promised inheritance, pass safely through the chequered sea of time; while all who endeavour to hinder our progress perish; not in so signal a manner as the enemies of the Israelites perished, but in as certain a manner. They were typically baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea, as a typical profession of allegiance to him. We are actually baptized in water, and make a positive profession of allegiance to Christ, thus becoming his subjects. In short, gentlemen, "Moses was a type of the Holy One that was to come; and by his hand the Israelites were led through those things which, to them, were shadows of the same grace and eternal salvation as baptism now is to us. Thus the believer by faith follows his Lord through the outward sign, in view of the living substance, by which he is brought out of a state of bondage and destruction into a state of salvation, life, and peace."

But when these same Israelites refused to follow Moses through the Jordan, the whole of them that were numbered, from twenty years old and upwards, except Caleb and Joshua, fell in the wilder-

* Deut. xviii. 15. † Isa. lv. 4.

ness. And will not a similar punishment befal those who now reject "the counsel of God," and refuse to follow Christ, by going down into the water, and being baptized in his name?*

The manna, and the water from the rock, were typical of the flesh and blood of Christ. Those supported animal life only; these support spiritual life. Many of those who eat and drank of the former died eternally; *i. e.*, they became subjects of the second death. But we, that eat and drink of the latter, never die. "Your fathers," said the Testator to the Jews, "did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.... Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.... This is the bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna and are *dead:* he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever."†

I shall now, gentlemen, prove to you in few words, in contradiction to these Witnesses, that the Israelites, while passing through the Red Sea, were neither sprinkled nor baptized, neither by the cloud nor by the sea. It appears that they crossed the sea by night, and that, before Moses stretched out his hand to divide the waters, the cloud was in their rear, and there remained until they had passed over.‡ That the waters, also, were motionless during the time, is self evident; for "the floods stood upright as an heap, and the depths were *congealed* in the heart of the sea."§ They could not, then, be either sprinkled or baptized, either by one or the other.

We have here, gentlemen, another instance of the Witnesses torturing a passage, not only to make it prove that infants are the subjects of baptism, but also that the Israelites, old and young, were literally sprinkled or baptized, either by the rain from the cloud, or by the spray from the sea, or by both; but whether by both, or by which, or whether they were baptized or sprinkled, they are not agreed.

The First Witness, after having given a correct version of the clause, would have acted wisely if he had sat down: but, wanting an example for sprinkling infants, he supposes that the cloud, the symbol of God's presence, was nothing more than a common cloud containing *aqueous* vapours. Does it not manifest a perversity of disposition in any one, to compare what Moses denominates "the

* See Luke vii. 30.
† John vi. 49. 54, 55. 58.
‡ Exodus xiv. 13. 19. 27.
§ Exodus xv. 8.

glory of the Lord"* to a flying vapour. Again, if the cloud performed the "threefold office, and supplied the Israelites with a sufficiency of *aqueous* particles, not only to cool the atmosphere and give refreshment to themselves and their cattle, but to supply them so abundantly, as thoroughly to sprinkle and envelope them," why did they murmur on the third day, because they had no water; for they still had the cloud? Or, where was the necessity of the Lord supplying them with it from the rock, if, as this Witness states, they had an abundant supply from the cloud? Did he never read of the prophet Isaiah's allusion to this cloud? "The Lord will create upon every dwelling place of Mount Zion, and upon her assemblies, a cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flame of fire by night; for upon all the glory shall be a defence."† Or what does he mean by saying, the apostle represents them as being thoroughly sprinkled or immersed? The terms are not synonymous. He came here to prove that they were sprinkled, and why does he evade the proof?

The Second Witness, after testifying that the cloud did *sometimes* bedew and sprinkle them, went on to say, their passage seemed to be *buried* in the waters, as persons in that age were *put under water*, when they were baptized. And if this be, as he declares it is, "a figure to which our baptism answers," how comes it to pass, gentlemen, that he rejects the counsel of God against himself,‡ and that the word baptize has not the same meaning now as it had then? A sound answer to these questions will not only show that he is in error, and that the word baptize means to immerse, in *all cases* where it applies to the ordinance of the Testator, but also, that the sprinkling of an infant is not figurative of the baptism he describes.

Gentlemen, it is clear that our Lord, when he was baptized, went down into, or he could not have "come up out of, the water." And how do the Plaintiffs pretend to follow him? Why, by bringing their babes to the font, where the priest sprinkles a few drops of water on their faces: and it is in this way that the Witness advocates "following him to the death." Is there here, gentlemen, any indication of these self-denominated christians being the antitype of the ancient people of God? Do they follow the Testator through the water, as the Jews followed Moses? No. Do not they, after the manner of the Jews in the days of Jeremiah,§ follow false prophets and false priests? And may not the religious portion of the people

* Exodus xvi. 10. † Isa. iv. 5. ‡ Luke vii. 30. § Jer. xxiii. 11—28.

of England whom these Witnesses represent, seeing they profess to take the scriptures for their guidance, be also compared to the Jews as spoken of in Ezekiel v. 5, 6? "Thus saith the Lord God, This is Jerusalem; I have set it in the midst of the nations and countries that are round about her. And she hath changed my judgments into wickedness more than the nations, and my statutes more than the countries that are round about her: for they have refused my judgments and my statutes, they have not walked in them." I would recommend to our opponents to study the remainder of the chapter, and, by a timely turning to the truth, elude a repetition of the calamity.

From the Israelites as a body being typical of the church of Christ, we may understand the Fourth Witness to mean, that, as infants made a part of that church, so they make a part of the true one; but as he implies that the overshadowing of the former by the cloud and by the sea was a resemblance of the manner by which all *professed* christians were admitted into the church at baptism, I see not how it can, at the same time, resemble the sprinkling of infants, they being incapable of making a profession.

On this passage, the Fifth Witness, not seeing the apostle's allusion to be typical, is bewildered, and therefore seems to think that Paul's assertion was incorrect. But he tells you that what Asaph, in the seventy-seventh Psalm, says, proves that there was an actual baptism. But here, again, he is wrong. Where Asaph mentions rain, the allusion may be to the seventh sign shown to Pharaoh; he says, "the *clouds* poured out water," not the *cloud*. But as this Witness is himself doubtful of his evidence being admitted, and as you, gentlemen, can have no doubt on the subject, it is useless to follow him further.

As for the evidence of the Seventh Witness, you are well aware that Paul, in the clause before us, informs the Corinthians that it was their *fathers* that were baptized unto Moses; men that were capable of professing allegiance: consequently, there is nothing in it that favours the practice of christening infants.

Gentlemen, nothing is more easy to conceive, than that, if the statement of the Eighth Witness be correct, the Israelites were not only sprinkled, but drenched; and that they had a most uncomfortable journey. This, in the nature of things, could not possibly have been the case; for it is distinctly stated, that they went over on *dry* land, and that "the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea."*

* Exod. xv. 8.

It is therefore manifest, that his evidence is the production of his own brain, and is therefore of no force. Until he prove that the wind can send forth sprays from ice, this *incontrovertible instance* of his must rest in abeyance.

I cannot but regard the way in which the Tenth Witness spoke of the words of the Spirit of God as both offensive and impious; and although his manner of turning the clause into ridicule may be pleasing to his friends, still, the lightness and irreverence with which he treats the text cannot be received in this court as evidence. It is unworthy of your attention, and undeserving of further remark.

Nor is there anything decisive to be gathered from the evidence of the other Witnesses, no two of whom are of one mind.

The First Witness said, that the Israelites were thoroughly immersed, or sprinkled, by the cloud.

The Tenth, that if this was dipping, it was dry dipping.

The Fifth, that they were not even sprinkled, much less immersed

The Second, that the cloud did sometimes sprinkle them.

The Eighth, that they were sprinkled by the spray.

The Fourth, that they were initiated as by baptism into the true religion, by the cloud and by the waters; but he forbore to give his definition of the meaning of the word baptism; that he leaves to every man's conjecture, as he did the baptism of the eunuch.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON 1 PETER III. 21.

"The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

The First Witness said, "Noah believed in God, walked uprightly before him, and found grace in his sight; he obeyed him

in building the ark, and God made it the means of his salvation from the waters of the deluge. *Baptism* implies a consecration and dedication of the soul and body to God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. He who is faithful to his baptismal covenant, taking God, through Christ, by the Eternal Spirit, for his portion, is saved here from his sins, and, 'through the resurrection of Christ from the dead,' has the well-grounded hope of eternal glory. This is all plain; but was it the *deluge* itself, or the *ark*, or the *being saved* by that ark from the deluge, that was the *antitype* of which Peter speaks. Noah and his family were *saved by water*, *i. e.*, it was the instrument of their being saved, through the good providence of God. So the water of *baptism*, typifying the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit, is the means of its salvation to all those who receive this Holy Spirit, in its quickening, cleansing efficacy. Now as the waters of the flood could not have saved Noah and his family, had they not made use of the ark; so the water of baptism saves no man, but as it is the means of getting his heart purified by the Holy Spirit, and typifying to him that purification. The ark was not *immersed* in the water; had it been so, they must all have perished; but it was *borne upon the water*, and *sprinkled* with the *rain* that fell from heaven. This text, as far as I can see, says nothing in behalf of *immersion* in baptism, but is rather, from the circumstance mentioned before, in favour of sprinkling."

The Second Witness said; "Observe, 1. The type and the antitype, the ark and baptism; their salvation from the deluge by the ark, prefigureth our salvation from God's wrath by baptism. As all that were without the ark perished, and all within the ark were saved; so all that are engrafted into Christ by faith, whereof baptism is a seal, are saved, whilst the unbelieving and unbaptized part of the world perish. Baptism is such a mean of spiritual salvation now, as the ark was of Noah's and his family's temporal salvation then; 'the like figure, whereunto baptism, now saveth us.' 2. How our apostle expresses himself, and plainly declares what he means by that baptism which is saving; negatively, it is not the outward ceremony of sprinkling the face, or washing the body with water, that is saving, or any ways pleasing unto God, save only as it is an act and exercise of our obedience to his command and will; but positively, it is 'the answer of a good conscience towards God,' *i. e.*, the faithful answer of a resolved soul in the covenant of

baptism, who gives up himself to the obedience of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, and renounces the world, the flesh, and the devil; this covenanting is the condition of salvation, and baptism but the sign. Learn hence, That outward baptism alone saved none, but the inward only; and the sign and singular effect of inward baptism, is 'the answer of a good conscience towards God.' Yet we must not conclude, with the Anabaptists, from this text, that baptism can be of no saving advantage to infants, because they cannot at present make this answer of a good conscience; for in the same manner speaks St. Paul of circumcision, that the true circumcision before God, is the inward circumcision of the heart and spirit, and not the outward circumcision of the flesh. But who dare argue from thence, that the Jewish infants, for want of the inward circumcision, must not be admitted to the outward? The argument is the very same: will you say that the answer of a good conscience is absolutely necessary and expressly required, that baptism may be beneficial, therefore they only are to be baptized that can make this answer? The same may we say, that the inward circumcision of the heart was required, as the only acceptable circumcision in the sight of God; therefore they only are to be circumcised who have this inward circumcision of the heart. But as the one *was* the will of God, *so* is the other. True, indeed, the Jews did not admit proselytes to circumcision *then*, no more will we admit adult persons to baptism *now*, without the answer of a good conscience, or a solemn stipulation to be the Lord's for ever; but they admitted infants to circumcision without it: in like manner, the Christian Church now admits the children of christian parents to baptism, without such answer made by them, but for them only."*

The Fourth Witness said, "'The like figure,' or *the antitype* of Noah and his family's preservation in the ark and by the water, at that time saved christians, 'even baptism.' Christ is the true ark. His church is within the ark, and is therefore safe; but all without will be swept by the deluge of divine vengeance into destruction. Into this ark men enter by faith; this faith Jews and Gentiles professed, when by baptism they were admitted into the christian church; and thus the baptismal water formed as it were the sign of their safety. Yet it was not 'the washing away' the filth of the flesh, or the mere outward administration of baptism, however *rightly done;* not

* Page 897.

the outward sign, the *opus operatum*, which could effect this, unless it were also *rightly received*. It was therefore 'the answer of a good conscience towards God which saved; namely, when a man by regeneration of the Spirit was able to profess repentance, faith, and purposes of a new life, uprightly, and as in the presence of God, and sincerely to answer such questions as were put to persons on those occasions.* When Jews and Gentiles professed christianity, they were thus received into the church, exactly in the same manner as Gentiles had been into the Jewish Church by circumcision; but the argument concerning the baptism of infants born of christian parents is not at all affected by it. The apostle spoke of baptism as the initiatory ordinance of christianity, but he took care to remind men that the inward grace of baptism, even regeneration, from which all holy affections and actions spring, alone could introduce them into the true church, the ark of real security; and that no outward administration of baptism could effect this blessed translation into the kingdom of the Son of God. This salvation of believers was the effect of 'the resurrection of Christ.'"†

"The scriptures expressly declare," said the Fifth Witness, "that baptism is not the great instrument of regeneration. This is directly declared by *St. Peter*....In this passage he teaches that putting away the filth of the flesh is not, and that the answer of a good conscience is, the means of our salvation. In other words, baptism is not, but the virtuous character which is the effect of regeneration is, the means of eternal life to mankind. This character...is so far from being the consequence of baptism, that every adult candidate for this ordinance is required to possess it before he can be lawfully baptized according to the scriptures."‡

"Peter's language implies," said the Seventh Witness, "that being saved by water in the ark was *a figure*, and expresses that being saved by baptism is...a *corresponding figure;* and that we may not mistake the point of resemblance to which he refers, he observes of the ark, that in it a 'few, that is eight *(that is, the whole family,)* souls were saved by water.' When, therefore, we say that baptism is come in the room of circumcision, we say nothing more than Peter has said of its coming in the room of a prior ordinance of precisely the same nature; and we are justified in the inference which we

* Rom. x. 5—11. † 1 Peter iii. 21, 22. ‡ Vol. ii. page 516.

draw from the words of Paul respecting believers in Christ, that 'being buried with Christ in baptism, they are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands.'

"When we compare the ordinance of baptism with that of circumcision, we are led to the very same observations which we were led to when we compared it with that of going into the ark.*...The covenant is the same as that which was established with Noah. There is, as before, a particular establishment of it with Abraham; it contains the promises of the resurrection, and heavenly felicity, before the subordinate and temporal promise of the land of Canaan; it is also accompanied with an appropriate ordinance of confirmation: this ordinance is to be administered to the full extent of the family; and as God had given to Abraham, not only children, but bondmen and bondwomen, the administration is expressly extended to them. This covenant includes the promise of Canaan to Abraham's children in the line of Isaac; but it is evidently in itself 'the covenant of God in Christ,' and it is in virtue of the promises of salvation which it contains, and which were originally made to the fathers, that all subsequent, particular, and temporary promises are included. (Lev. xxvi. 42; Deut. iv. 31, and xxix. 13; Luke i. 67—75.)"†

The Eighth Witness said, "The circumstance or state of those in the ark, is said to be a *figure* or resemblance of christian baptism; but they were not dipt into the water and taken up again, as it is contended baptized persons ought to be, but only had water poured down upon them."‡

"Noah building of the ark," said the Ninth Witness, "and entering into it with his family, are therefore considered by St. Paul as the visible expression of his faith in the ancient promises of God respecting Messiah; and for this reason baptism is called by St. Peter, without any allegory at all, but in the sobriety of fact, '*the antitype*' of this transaction, the one exactly answering to the other, as an external expression of faith in the same objects and the same promises.

"But the apostle does not rest in this general representation. He proceeds to express, in a particular and most forcible manner, the nature of christian baptism; 'not the putting away of the filth of the flesh,' &c.... The meaning of the apostle is, that baptism is

* Gen. xvii. 7—14. † Pages 203—205. ‡ Page 94.

not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, not a mere external ceremony, but a rite which *demands* or *requires* something of us in order to the attainment of a 'good conscience.' What that is, we learn from the words of our Lord; it is faith in Christ; 'He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved.'...We see how St. Peter preserves the correspondence between the act of Noah in preparing the ark, as an act of faith by which he was justified, and the act of submitting to christian baptism, which is also obviously an act of faith, in order to the remission of sins, or the obtaining a good conscience before God. This is further strengthened by his immediately adding, 'by the resurrection of Jesus Christ,' a clause which our translators, by the use of a parenthesis, connect with 'baptism doth also now save us;' so that their meaning is, we are saved by baptism, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ; and as 'he rose again for our justification,' this sufficiently shows the true sense of the apostle, who by our being 'saved' clearly means our being justified by faith.

"The text, however, needs no parenthesis, and the true sense may be thus expressed: 'The antitype to which water of the flood, baptism, doth now save us, not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but that which intently seeks *a good conscience* towards God, through faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ.' But however a particular word may be disposed of, the whole passage can only be consistently taken to teach us that baptism is the outward sign of our entrance into God's covenant of mercy; and that when it is an act of true faith, it becomes an instrument of salvation, like that act of faith in Noah, by which, when moved with fear, he 'prepared an ark to the saving of his house.' and survived the destruction of an unbelieving world."*

Gentlemen, replied the Defendants' Counsel, does not Peter, by this passage, show the mighty importance which he who gave the command to baptize attached to this ordinance of baptism? And does not Peter also, by bringing before our eyes the dreadful consequences which befel a whole world, save eight persons, in consequence of neglecting the commandments of God, warn the dis-

* Pages 401—404.

obedient of the awful punishment which awaits their rebellion? Baptism, in its figurative sense, is compared to the water by which Noah was saved. It is evident the Lord had made his way known to the antediluvians, which, according to Gen. vi. 12, "all flesh had corrupted," except Noah, who was, so far as we have the means of judging, the only believer then in the world; for "the Lord said unto Noah, Come thou, and all thy house, into the ark; for thee have I seen righteous before me in this generation."* To him the Lord gave directions to build the ark; yet, if he had not entered into it, he would have perished. But he did, according to the Lord's command, in faith enter into it, and in faith he went forth out of it,† and was thus saved. "Saved from the sin and wretchedness of the old world, and introduced into the happiness of the new—a figure of eternal salvation by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." "The like figure whereunto, baptism, doth also now save us," &c. Not by the mere act of baptism, but by that which the baptism represents, the resurrection of Jesus Christ. So, as baptism is, in accordance with the Lord's command, a going down in faith into, a being overwhelmed in, and a coming up out of the water, so it is a striking and lively figure of this salvation. And thus are we as certainly saved from eternal, as Noah and his family were from temporal destruction. Does not Peter, then, testify that we can no more be saved independent of baptism, than Noah could have been saved independent of the ark? Or that as none out of the ark escaped the deluge, so none out of the church can escape destruction? And does he not also testify that there can be no good conscience but what is purified by that faith which the believer testifies in baptism?

Some may object, and say that the unbelieving part of Noah's family were also saved. True, but from the nature of the narrative we have no scriptural reason to suppose that their salvation was anything more than temporal; while that of Noah was not only temporal, but a convincing type of his eternal salvation, as we see in 2 Pet. ii. 5; "And spared not the old world, but saved Noah, the eighth person, a preacher of righteousness, bringing in the flood upon the world of the ungodly." From the chapter I have just mentioned, which details the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, we derive further proof of the awful consequences of trampling under foot the commandments of God. Lot was the only righteous person in those two cities, and on that account was saved. His sons-in-law

* Gen. vii. 1. † Heb. xi. 7.

might have been saved also, if they would; but they scorned his advice, and were consequently destroyed. And although his wife did accompany him, she appears to have left her heart among the wicked, and, looking back, was turned into "a pillar of salt."

The conclusion, then, gentlemen, according to "the like figure," is, that as Noah and Lot were saved through testifying their faith in God,—the one by entering the ark, and the other by quitting the city of Sodom,—so there is no other way of salvation for us, but that of believing, and of testifying our faith by being baptized, and afterwards by "observing all things whatsoever" the Testator has commanded.

The conduct of the sons-in-law of Lot, who, if they had followed their father's command, might have been saved from the conflagration, may be taken as an example or proof that all who have the gospel in their hands may, if they will follow its commands, be saved with an everlasting salvation;* which command is, "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty." It may also be confidently asserted, that where the gospel is, no man can perish but by his own voluntary neglect of its commands, admonitions, teachings, and persuasions.

You could not fail to observe, gentlemen, how cautiously the First Witness, in spite of tradition and early prejudices, gave his evidence: he did not dare to say anything stronger in favour of sprinkling, than that "the text rather favours it." Gentlemen, that doubtful word *rather* is significant. The house he lives in is oft-times sprinkled with rain; will he say that "that is indicative of *sprinkling in baptism*," or that all in his house are thus christened?

This text, gentlemen, was not intended to explain the import of the term baptize, but to point out to us that the former world was condemned, and that Noah, by entering through faith into the ark, was saved; and also that the world now is under condemnation, from which there is no way of escape but by entering, through a similar faith, into the ark of safety, the Church of God.

Baptism, this Witness told you, implies a consecration and dedication of the soul to God. But then, gentlemen, the act of consecration and dedication must be performed in faith, in person, not by the proxy of godfathers and godmothers, nor yet by the vows of

* See also Jer. xxi. 8, 9.

parents. For "none of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him."*

The Second Witness, in the commencement of his evidence, spoke upon this clause boldly and truly. He told you what the apostle meant by the baptism which is saving; that it is not the outward ceremony, save as it is an act of obedience, but that it is the answer of a good conscience toward God—the faithful answer of one who gives himself up to him. This he told you was the condition of salvation, and baptism only the sign. How far the word "condition" is scripturally applicable, is to be questioned. Yet his prejudices forbad him to conclude "with the Anabaptists, from this text, that baptism can be of no saving advantage to infants, because they cannot at present make this answer of a good conscience." But, gentlemen, has he not himself so concluded it? He has stated that outward baptism saves none. And infants cannot by any possibility have anything more? Those who understand the Will do not argue, that because an infant Jew had not the inward circumcision, he ought not to have been admitted to that of the outward. The Jewish Church was a worldly sanctuary, a type only of the true church. Circumcision entitled the individuals to all its privileges, and their temporal rights were held under this proviso. But at the present day, a child has nothing either of a temporal or spiritual nature depending on his christening. On the contrary, in the vast majority of cases, it is injurious to him; for it begets an impression, though of an indefinite nature, that there is some privilege conferred by it; and this impression, remaining to the end of his life, renders him indifferent to his real interest. The Defendants, therefore, dare to, and do, assert, that, according to the Will, the answer of a good conscience is absolutely necessary, and expressly required,† and is to be manifested in the first instance by the ordinance of baptism.—Where it is not thus manifested, even the dipping (to say nothing of sprinkling) of either child or man, is a mockery. And is there a question if the dipping of the latter, as administered occasionally in the Establishment, is not the greatest mockery of the two, because in dipping or sprinkling the former, there is one innocent party among them. And I shall here, gentlemen, request your attention while I read a paragraph from a newspaper which I hold in my hand. It is headed, and proceeds as follows:—

"Adult Baptism, by Immersion, at Christ Church.

* Psalm xlix. 7. † See Rom. x. 10; Acts ii. 38.

"We have lately heard a great deal about the introduction of 'novelties' into the Church of England, the 'novelties' in question being the mere revival, by conscientious clergymen, of certain forms and observances, which, though commanded by the rubric, have been permitted by their predecessors to fall into desuetude. On Wednesday, however, at Christ's Church, Liverpool, we had the opportunity of witnessing the resuscitation of an ordinance which has stood in abeyance infinitely longer, and by far more general consent, than any of which we had previously any knowledge. This was no less than the admitting of an adult into the Church of England by baptism, in the form of immersion, which ceremony was performed by the Rev. Fielding Ould, the incumbent, in presence of a very numerous congregation of both sexes... A large marble font, kindly lent, we understand, by Mr. Baker, was placed in the centre aisle, close to the reading-desk, and the neophyte, who was of the softer sex, and dressed in white, occupied a convenient pew with her sponsors. After the second lesson, the parties were arranged in front of the reading-desk, while the former part of the baptismal service was read in a very impressive manner....The minister then came down from the desk, and while he pronounced the ante-baptismal prayer, the font was more than half filled with tepid water. The candidate, who had made all the responses in a firm, audible voice, then entered the water by means of steps, and being immersed to the middle, the minister, who held her right hand, dipped her head under the water, and repeated the appointed formulas, naming and receiving her, and signing her forehead with the sign of the cross. The lady then stepped out of the font, a cloak was thrown over her, and she was conducted to one of the vestries, where she replaced her wet habiliments with dry clothing....The lady and her sponsors having retired (qu. returned) to the front of the reading-desk, the minister finished the baptismal service, after which evening prayer was concluded. The Rev. F. Ould then ascended the pulpit, and preached from Deut. xxix. 9—13. The Rev. gentleman, at the commencement of his discourse, remarked that the interesting ceremony in which they had been engaged might appear strange, but it was only strange because it was unusual, and not because it was unorthodox. He then proceeded to quote the rubric, from which he said it was clear that dipping was the rule of the church, and sprinkling the exception; allowed, perhaps, because it was more convenient, and it might be because there was less danger to the

health of the person baptized. He then quoted many passages of scripture, and from the writings of Bishop Whately, who he said was acknowledged to be the highest possible authority on the rubrics, as to dipping, and appeared particularly anxious that his congregation should be made aware that nothing had been done contrary to the injunctions and orders of the church, and showing strongly how little any scruple as to the mode of administration, or as to the baptizing of infants, could justify separation from the National Church. The candidate was one of a Baptist family, many of whom are still regular attendants at the little chapel in Comus-street, and it was of course entirely in compliance with her own express desire that the form of immersion was used."*

Now, gentlemen, if the manner of dipping here recorded were not of too awful and fearful a character for satire, we might be tempted to indulge in it. Suffice it to say, that the proceeding was at best a base imitation of the ordinance of baptism, as instituted by God, whereby a believer is to make a confession of his sins, in order to the remission of them;†—as it was established and commanded to be preached by the Saviour of the world;‡ and as it was taught by his apostles.§ Of the true baptism, as I have previously said, we have a perfect pattern in the case of the eunuch; and let any person of common understanding say if there is any, the most distant, similitude between that of the eunuch, and that of which you have just heard. You may naturally enquire why the reverend incumbent did not follow this pattern; why he did not go with the neophyte *down* into the water; and why he asked of her if she renounced the devil and all his works, &c. These are questions which no individual that ever lived, save the Son of God, could truly answer.‖ The very act that she was about to perform pronounced the falsity of her professions. It might also be asked, Why did he name her, seeing she had been named more than thirty years previously? While the only authority he could boast for requiring sponsors to witness her profession, or for signing her forehead with the sign of the cross, was the Prayer-book, a compilation of men!¶ You observed, gentlemen, how particularly anxious the minister was stated to be, to make his congregation aware that nothing had been done contrary to the injunctions and orders of the church; *how strongly he shewed*

* Liverpool Mail, February 1, 1845.
† Mark i. 4.
‡ Mark xvi. 16; Luke xxiv. 46, 47.
§ Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16.
‖ 1 John i. 8—10.
¶ See Matt. xv. 8, 9; Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

that any scruple as to the mode of administration, or as to the baptizing infants, could justify separation from the National Church, and how insinuatingly he introduced the subject. Had not our Lord's threatening* some bearing on such a transaction? And had not Paul's entreaty† some bearing on the transactors? Nay, gentlemen, was not the whole of the administration, *from first to last*, a solemn mockery, an offence of the deepest dye, a despite done to the great Institutor of the holy ordinance, since all the parties concerned in it were alike guilty? If the neophyte did not know better, her ignorance was culpable, for she had had an opportunity of knowing "the truth;" but as she has turned from it, so much the worse for her. Then observe, gentlemen, if the incumbent follows out the rubric, in what a strange situation the new proselyte is placed. He received her into the congregation, which he denominates "Christ's flock;" and yet the Rubric says it is expedient that every person thus baptized should be confirmed by the bishop, so soon after her baptism as conveniently may be, that so she may be admitted to the holy communion. This opportunity may not arrive for years afterwards, and where is she in the mean time? In some intermediate place, neither in the communion of the church, nor out of it. How this accords with Acts ii. 41, 42, 47, I leave the parties themselves to explain. Still we must allow that the incumbent, if he follow out the Rubric, is doing his duty according to his subscription to the formularies of the church; whether he is doing it in accordance with the gospel of Christ, is another matter. Has he not, to use the words of Jeremiah,‡ "healed the daughter of my people slightly, saying, Peace, peace, when there was no peace"? And would not Deut. xii. 30, or Isa. xxiv. 5, have been a more appropriate text than Deut. xxix. 9—13? It is true that we have lately heard much of the introduction of novelties into the church—aye, and even of uproar and rebellion in respect of preaching in a white or a black gown; and yet, as Mr. Ould informs us, and informs us truly, dipping is the rule of the church, and sprinkling the exception. Nevertheless, with the occurrence of a solitary instance, similar to this one, in the course of about every dozen years, the rule is laid aside, and the exception invariably practised, without any outbreak either among clergy or laity, and without remonstrance of any moment from either. This but evinces what an easy matter it is to "strain at a gnat, and to

* Matt. xxiii. 15. † Rom. xvi. 17, 18. ‡ Jer. viii. 11.

swallow a camel. However, it is matter of rejoicing to the christian, that as the font was only borrowed for the occasion, such a gross profanation of the holy ordinance is not intended to be repeated. Yet the profanation is a striking proof that the forty and two months which were given to the Gentiles to tread under foot the holy city* are not yet expired. I have before explained to you, gentlemen, why and when sprinkling succeeded to dipping; and, leaving Mr. Ould's account of it for your consideration, beg to apologize for the digression, and proceed with the evidence.

None are commanded to be baptized but those who are taught of God; and it is impossible that any man so taught can either reject the ordinance,† or receive it at the hands of one who vitiates it. It is faith that makes baptism available. This faith Abraham had‡ before he was circumcised; but his natural posterity prided themselves on their outward circumcision, as the people of this day, a people who are incongruously supposed to be made christians by proxy, do of their christening.

I should like to know, gentlemen, how to reconcile the contradictory statements of the Fourth Witness; or what is to save these christened infants. He informs you, that the mere administration of sprinkling, however *rightly done*, would not effect it, unless it were *rightly received;* but how an unconscious being can receive it, rightly or otherwise, I cannot conceive. While, on the one hand, they are said to be made members of the church at the time they are christened, yet, on the other hand, they are not regarded as members until they are, or are ready to be, confirmed. Then it is that they are first inducted into that church which the Witness calls the ark of safety. If this be the case, then all those who die in the intermediate time, between their christening and confirmation, are during that period "without," and, according to his evidence, "swept by divine vengeance into destruction." According to him, too, the same destruction awaits every individual who has been christened, and has died in infancy; for no one of them was capable of receiving it rightly. Nay, it may be asked, which even of "those of riper years" could have received a thing rightly, which is not only enveloped in error, but which is not administered rightly?

With respect to the evidence of the Fifth Witness—if he means us to understand that no one but a genuine believer can be scripturally baptized, that the water in baptism is not the instrument of

* Rev. xi. 2. † Acts viii. 35—38. ‡ Gen. xv. 6.

salvation, he must cease to advocate the christening of infants; for what can infants have beyond that instrument, unconscious as they must necessarily be of every thing, save the chilling sensation which the sprinkled water may produce?

The Seventh Witness, according to his own account, says nothing more than the apostle Peter said; that baptism was come in the room of circumcision; but as he brought no proof of the fact we will pass it by. I have before shown, that baptism was added to, rather than introduced in the place of circumcision; for all who were baptized by John and the Testator had been previously circumcised. Besides, the ordinances were different, and instituted for different purposes. The one was merely a mark put upon the typical people of God, by which they were particularly distinguished as the race through whom the Testator should descend, and kept separate from other nations; the other was for the antitypes, his true people, whereby to confess before men their faith in his promises; and thus, being buried with Christ in baptism, they became circumcised with the circumcision made without hands. Abraham, as I have previously said, is the only person we read of that was circumcised after he believed.* In the instance of Abraham only, therefore, was circumcision under the old dispensation a token of a spiritual covenant, in the same manner as baptism is to the believer of the new. "They which be of faith, are blessed with faithful Abraham."†

In reply to the Eighth Witness, common sense assures us that the water was poured down on the ark, not on the people who were in the ark. This circumstance, then, cannot be figurative of effusing either child or man; while he does not abide even by his own figure, for in all cases he sprinkles them. The ark of Noah, gentlemen, is represented as a figure, and baptism as that of another figure, of the same thing—the salvation of God by Jesus Christ. The ark and baptism, then, being like figures, it necessarily follows, that as all were shut out of the ark who did not believe the preaching of Noah; so all are now shut out of the church, of which the ark is a figure, who have not believed the preaching of Christ, and entered into it by the way which he has appointed. Nay, that they must remain shut out, unless they repent, and follow in his footsteps. But this does not affect innocents, because, according to the apostle, they are not under any law.‡

The Ninth Witness, for once, gave his evidence in a straightfor-

* Rom. iv. 11, 12. † Gal. iii. 9. ‡ Rom. iv. 15.

ward, manly manner. He not only allows that Peter preserves the correspondence between Noah's building and entering into the ark as an act of faith, and the believer entering into the church by baptism as a like act of faith, in order to the remission of sins, or the obtaining of a good conscience, the baptism which now saves, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ: but he allows also that Noah's entering the ark was considered by the apostle Paul as the visible expression of his faith in the ancient promises respecting Messiah; for which reason, baptism is called by Peter "the antitype" of this transaction, the one exactly answering to the other, as an external expression of faith in the same objects and the same promises. Thus conceding to us another grand point which we were brought here to defend.

"Submitting to christian baptism" is an unhappy expression. If the Witness were called to possess a valuable earthly estate, he would not say he submitted to the requirements which put him in possession of it. By a parity of reasoning, then, the believer, who is called to possess a heavenly inheritance, cannot with propriety say he submits to the act of baptism, the rite by which he enters into the enjoyment of it. No: he rejoices that he has been made meet to put this seal to his faith; and that he can, with pleasure, through humble boldness, confess "what the Lord has done for his soul;"* confidently resting upon the promise of the Redeemer, that whosoever confesses his name before men, him will he confess also before his Father which is in heaven.† Believers, gentlemen, are not ashamed to confess him; they are "not as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance."‡ No: they "worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh."§

* Psalm lxvi. 16. † Matt. x. 32. ‡ Matt. vi. 16. § Phil. iii. 3.

EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES ON ROM. VI. 3—5, AND COL. II. 12, 13.

"KNOW YE NOT, THAT SO MANY OF US AS WERE BAPTIZED INTO JESUS CHRIST, WERE BAPTIZED INTO HIS DEATH? THEREFORE WE ARE BURIED WITH HIM BY BAPTISM INTO DEATH; THAT LIKE AS CHRIST WAS RAISED UP FROM THE DEAD BY THE GLORY OF THE FATHER, EVEN SO WE ALSO SHOULD WALK IN NEWNESS OF LIFE. FOR IF WE HAVE BEEN PLANTED TOGETHER IN THE LIKENESS OF HIS DEATH, WE SHALL BE ALSO IN THE LIKENESS OF HIS RESURRECTION."

"BURIED WITH HIM IN BAPTISM, WHEREIN ALSO YE ARE RISEN WITH HIM THROUGH THE FAITH OF THE OPERATION OF GOD, WHO HATH RAISED HIM FROM THE DEAD. AND YOU, BEING DEAD IN YOUR SINS AND THE UNCIRCUMCISION OF YOUR FLESH, HATH HE QUICKENED TOGETHER WITH HIM, HAVING FORGIVEN YOU ALL TRESPASSES."

The FIRST WITNESS said, "Every man who believes the christian religion, and receives baptism as the proof that he believes it, and has taken up the profession of it, is bound thereby to a life of righteousness. 'To be baptized into Christ,' is to receive the doctrine of Christ crucified, and to receive baptism as a proof of the genuineness of that faith, and the obligation to live according to its precepts.

"'Baptized into his death.' That as Jesus Christ in his crucifixion died completely, so that no spark of the *natural* or *animal life* remained in his body, so those who profess his religion should be so completely *separated* and *saved from* sin, that they have no more *connexion* with it, nor any more *influence* from it, than *a dead man* has with or from his *departed* spirit.

"'We are buried with him by baptism into death.' It is *probable* that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering

baptism by *immersion*, the whole body being put *under the water*, which seemed to say, the man is *drowned*, is *dead;* and when he came up out of the water, he seemed to have a *resurrection* to life — *the man is risen again, he is alive.* He was therefore supposed to throw off his old *Gentile* state, as he threw off his clothes, and to assume a new character, as the baptized generally put on new or fresh garments. I say it is *probable* that the apostle alludes to this mode of immersion; but it is not absolutely *certain* that he does so, as some do imagine; for in the next verse, our being incorporated into Christ by *baptism* is also denoted by our being *planted*, or rather *grafted together in the likeness of his death;* and Noah's ark, *floating* upon the water, and *sprinkled by the rain from heaven, is a figure* corresponding to *baptism;* but neither of these gives us the same idea of the outward form as *burying;* we must be careful, therefore, not to lay too much stress on such circumstances....

"'Buried with him in baptism,'* alluding to the *immersions* practised in the case of *adults*, wherein the persons appeared to be buried under the water, as Christ was buried in the heart of the earth. His rising again the third day, and their emerging from the water, was an emblem of the resurrection of the body, and in them of a total change of life. They were quickened, changed, and saved by means of faith in Christ Jesus, which faith was produced by the operation or energy of God. *Believing* is the act of the soul, but the *grace* or *power* to *believe* comes from God himself....

"1. The doctrine of the resurrection of our Lord was a grand doctrine among the apostles; they considered and preached this as the *demonstration* of the *truth* of the *gospel.* 2. The multitudes who embraced christianity became converts on the *evidences* of this resurrection. 3. This resurrection was considered the *pledge* and *proof* of the resurrection of all believers in Christ, to the possession of the same glory into which he had entered. The baptism which they had received, they considered as an emblem of their *natural death* and resurrection."†

The Second Witness said, "To be 'baptized into Christ,' is by baptism to take the name of Christ upon us, to be incorporated, engrafted, and implanted into the church of Christ, being made

* Col. ii. 12. † 1 Cor. xv. 29.

visible members of his mystical body by baptism; to be 'baptized into Christ's death,' imports our being conformed to him 'in the likeness of his death,' our being engaged to die unto sin, as Christ died for sin. Learn hence, That the death of Christ was a lively representation of the death of sin, and believers are to imitate his death in their dying daily unto sin....The argument to move us to die unto sin is drawn from our baptism—'We are buried with him by baptism unto death.' The apostle alludes no doubt to the ancient manner and way of baptizing persons in those hot countries, which was by immersion, or putting them under water for a time, and then raising them up again out of the water, which rite had also a mystical signification, representing the burial of our old man, sin in us, and our resurrection to newness of life. Learn hence, That the ordinance of baptism lays every baptized person under the strongest engagements and the highest obligations to die unto sin, and walk in newness of life. The metaphors of burying and rising again do imply and intimate thus much; burial implies a continuing under death; this is mortification, a continued act, a daily dying unto sin; and rising again supposes a person never more to be under the power of death.*

"Our apostle here, Col. ii. 12, compares Christian baptism with the Jewish circumcision, and shows that the signification and spiritual intention of both was one and the same, obliging all persons who took the outward sign upon them, to put off the old man, and put on the new; to die unto sin, and live unto God....Baptism is undoubtedly Christ's ordinance for infants of believing Christians, as circumcision was of old for the infants of believing Jews....And the Jews would certainly have objected to the reproach of christianity, had not the christians had a rite of initiation for their children, as they had of circumcision, which sealed the covenant to themselves and their little ones, and was the door by which all persons entered into the Jewish church."†

The THIRD WITNESS said, "The apostle says to the Colossians, 'Buried with Christ in baptism,' &c....Dead in their sins, and buried in baptism; by baptism also they were raised and quickened by God.

"To the Romans he employs the same figure, describing baptism as a burial, wherein they were dead unto sin, and alive unto God;

* Page 190. † Page 731.

adding, withal, a particular which confirms an opinion,... that no other than baptismal regeneration is to be expected in this world. For having observed that 'Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him; for in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God,'* the apostle immediately subjoins, 'Likewise reckon ye also yourselves,'—likewise, in a like or in the same manner,—'to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.' Does not the language of the apostle warrant the argument, that we are born anew in baptism, and in baptism exclusively?"†

The FOURTH WITNESS said, "The apostle, by his introductory question, most emphatically shows that all who had been baptized into the name and religion of Jesus, had received the sign and made the profession of communion with him and conformity to him in his death....This profession was equivalent to 'being buried with Christ,' as dead with him. For as his burial was a manifestation that he was really dead, and an introduction to his immediate resurrection... so the baptism of a converted Jew or Gentile was a professed manifestation of his death to sin, and to all his carnal expectations, affections, and pursuits, from which he meant to be entirely secluded, as one buried is from the affairs of life: and it was a professed introduction to his walking 'in newness of life,' not only as to his outward actions, but with respect to his inward principles. The spiritual meaning of the external sign is the same when baptism is administered to the infant offspring of believers; even as the meaning of circumcision was the same, when it was performed on Abraham the aged believer, on Ishmael who perhaps never believed, and on Isaac an infant of eight days old, long before he believed....Great stress has been laid upon the expression 'buried with him by baptism into death,' as proving that baptism ought to be performed by *immersion*, to which the apostle is supposed to allude.‡ But we are said also to be 'crucified with Christ,' and *circumcised* with him, without any allusion to the outward manner in which crucifixion and circumcision were performed; and as baptism is far more frequently mentioned with reference to the '*pouring out*' of the Holy Ghost,§ and as the apostle is evidently treating on the inward meaning, not the outward form, of that ordinance, no conclusive argument is deducible from

* Rom. vi. 4—11. † Page 32. ‡ Col. ii. 11, 12.
§ Acts i. 4—8; ii. 14—21; Titus iii. 4. 7.

the expression, showing that immersion is *necessary* to baptism; or even, apart from other proof, that baptism was generally thus administered.*

"Instead of the outward sign of circumcision, baptism had been substituted, which some suppose to be meant by 'the circumcision of Christ:'† this represented that death and burial with him from former confidences and sinful and worldly pursuits, which true christians experience, in order to their being made conformable to him in his resurrection. The baptism of Jews and Gentiles, when converted to christianity, implied their 'death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness,' their entrance into the church and kingdom of Christ, the washing away of the guilt and pollution of their sins, and their dedication to the service of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in whose name, as the God of their salvation, they were baptized. The same inward change had been signified by circumcision, which was administered to adult proselytes, and then to their offspring; so that no argument can hence be deduced against the baptism of infants."‡

Cross-examined.—Indeed, "Paul was even 'crucified with Christ;' the demands of the law on him had been answered by his Surety, in his obedience unto the death of the cross; and his union with Christ had made him to die to all legal dependences, as well as to the love and friendship of the world, the delights and interests of sin, and all those carnal principles from which his former activity arose.§

"The disciples of Jesus...had the true circumcision, which was not performed on their bodies by the hands of men, but on their hearts by the Holy Spirit; and in consequence of this regeneration they were daily employed in 'putting off the body of the sins of the flesh.' This was the true circumcision, which Christ himself performed on the hearts of his people by his Holy Spirit."‖

The Fifth Witness said, "The word *buried* is here supposed to denote *immersion*. In the next verse it is said, 'For if we are planted together in the likeness of his death.' Our antagonists are bound to show that this figurative expression, which refers to the same thing, does not as strictly signify the mode in which baptism is received as the word *buried;* and if it does, to point out the

* Rom. vi. 3, 4. † Col. ii. 11. ‡ Col. ii. 11.
§ Gal. ii. 20. ‖ Col. ii. 11.

particular mode of administering baptism denoted by the word planting."*

The SIXTH WITNESS said, "In these passages, our brethren conceive there is an obvious reference to the mode of baptism by immersion. ...Two things may just be noticed here, before proceeding to the explanation of the passages. The first is, that it is obviously incorrect to speak of the ordinance as exhibiting 'the *death* of Christ,' as well as his burial and resurrection; for whatever resemblance fancy may imagine to the two latter, there is surely no representation of the former. The *death* can only be considered as *implied* in the *burial*. The second is, that even to the burial and resurrection of Christ, the immersion of a body under water, and its emersion from it, bear but a very indistinct and remote resemblance. The mind may easily indeed habituate itself to the idea of likeness, between being let down under *earth*, and raised out of it, and being let down under *water*, and raised out of it. But where is the likeness between the latter of these, and the carrying of a body by a lateral door into a cavern hewn out of a rock, and that body reviving and coming forth by the same....I confess this resemblance, on which so much stress is laid by our Baptist brethren, has always appeared to me but a far-fetched fancy. I shall say nothing stronger, lest I should possibly be in the wrong in so considering it.†...

"To be 'baptized into Christ,' is to be baptized into the faith of him as the Messiah; into the faith of his divine mission, character, and work. To be 'baptized into his death,' is to be baptized into the faith of his death, in the view which the gospel gives of it, as the death of a Surety or Substitute making atonement for the sins of those for whom he died. Now by being thus 'baptized into his death,' says the apostle, we are 'buried with him.' The simple meaning of this expression evidently is, that by being baptized into the faith of his death, as the death of our surety and substitute, we become *partakers with him in it*. When the apostle, pursuing his beautiful illustration of the spiritual connexion of believers with Christ, and the practical obligations thence arising, says, in the 8th verse, 'Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him,' he uses a phrase of equivalent import with the one before us. To be *dead with Christ*, and to be *buried with Christ*, are the same thing. The latter of these two phrases appears to be

* Vol. 2, page 547. † Page 156.

used in the 4th verse, chiefly for the sake of *completing the apostle's figure*, as it was necessary, in order to Christ's *rising*, that he should be *laid in the grave; so in the figure*, it is necessary that we should be viewed as buried with him, in order to our *rising with him* to newness of life.

"The simple meaning is this: since in our being baptized into Jesus Christ, we are baptized *into his death*, into the faith of his death as the death of a surety, we may be considered as by faith partaking with him in his death, as *buried with him;* and that with the special end of our rising with him in a spiritual resemblance to his resurrection, and 'walking in newness of life.' Now it is quite obvious that the *argument* of the apostle has not the remotest connexion with the *mode of baptism*. There is not the most distant occasion for the supposition of any such allusion in order to render the passage intelligible; nor does the allusion, when supposed, impart to it any addition of force or propriety. The meaning does not in the least degree depend on the manner of performing the ceremony; it turns entirely on its being baptism 'into Christ's death;' provided it was this, it makes not the smallest difference to the apostle's statement, or argument, or conclusion, whether we suppose it to have been by immersion, by pouring, or by sprinkling.

"The same observations apply, with at least equal, if not greater force, to the parallel passage, Col. ii. 12. Believers are there said to be '*risen*, as well as *buried*, with Christ in baptism.' They were not baptized into the faith of Christ's *death* alone, as the death of their surety; they were baptized also into the faith of his *resurrection*, as the resurrection of their surety; and as by the former they became, in virtue of their connexion with him as a surety, partakers with him in his death, so by the latter they became, in the same way, partakers with him also in the resurrection. Being baptized into the faith of both, they had, by faith, fellowship or union with him in both. *How* is it, accordingly, that they are said to be risen with him? It is 'through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead,' that is, through the faith of his resurrection, effected by the operation or mighty power of God. Their being 'risen with him in baptism,' does not therefore refer to any emblematic representation of a resurrection in the mode of the ordinance, but to their being one with him in his resurrection, through faith in him as the surety of sinners. And in this view they might with perfect propriety be said to be risen with him in

baptism, whatever was the mode of its administration, provided only it was baptism '*into the faith of his resurrection.*'

"It has indeed been alleged, that in whatever sense believers are said to be buried and risen with Christ, they could not be represented as so buried and risen *in baptism* unless there were in that ordinance some *representation* of that burial and resurrection. I observe in reply, 1. Although the expression in Col. ii. 12, is 'buried with him *in* baptism,' yet in Rom. vi. 4. it is different; 'buried with him *by baptism* into his death,'...which does not at all imply any such similitude in the ordinance, but directs the attention to *that into which they were baptized;* which indeed, as I have noticed, is the point on which the whole reasoning turns. 2. Although it was, strictly speaking, in believing, that the converts became partakers with Christ in his death and resurrection, yet it is not unusual to speak of things as taking place *in baptism,* which properly took place *by faith,* because baptism was the first public declaration of the faith of the converts, and of their belonging to the body of Christ. It is on the same principle that they are spoken of as in baptism 'washing away their sins,' and 'putting on Christ.' 3. In Rom. vi. the language of the whole passage is figurative."*

The Seventh Witness said, "The great, and, as it appears to me, the only original reason why baptism has been thought to imply immersion, is the expression which occurs in Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12; in the first of which the apostle Paul says,...'therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death.' And in the second,... 'buried with him in baptism.' In both passages, the expression seems to be of the same import....He appeals to the meaning of our baptism, which, being the first ordinance observed among converts, in the original propagation of the gospel, may be justly considered as exhibiting the first principles of the oracles of God, and the first elements of christian character. 'Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death?' He then infers, that since baptism has so immediate a reference to the death of Christ, it must, by consequence, be connected also with his resurrection; and that as, in the former view, it teaches the regenerating, the abandoning of the old life of sin; so, in the latter, it equally teaches them the habitual, increasing, and permanent

* Pages 158—162.

pursuit and progress of the new life of righteousness. 'Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death,' &c.

"A particular emphasis is here laid on our being 'buried with Christ,' &c. The expression contains an allusion to our Lord's burial, and to our being buried with him by baptism into his death. This allusion must have been well understood at first, for it is here made as an illustration. From various causes, however, it now requires illustration itself. This we shall endeavour to supply, in the hope that we may, by means of it, not only understand the apostles' language, but, through the blessing of God, feel, and be led more and more to exemplify, the force of his reasoning.

"It is a common remark, that the apostle is treating in this passage, not of the form of baptism, but of its object, its design, and its actual effects. On this account, many are of opinion that no inference can be drawn from his language concerning the form of baptism at all. Perhaps it would be more correct to say, that he is here treating of the connexion between the justification and the sanctification of christians, and that, in doing so, he makes three distinct allusions to baptism, to grafting, and to crucifixion. In each of these, therefore, there must be points of resemblance; for all the allusions of scripture are admirably correct, and wherever we meet with any which seem to be exceptions from this character, we have much reason to suspect that the difficulty is owing to our own inattention and ignorance.

"That this has been remarkably the case with the allusion to baptism, in the passage before us, will perhaps appear in the sequel. To many it presents no difficulty. They have been accustomed to think baptism and immersion to be synonymous terms. They conceive the expression, 'buried with him in baptism,' to arise from the resemblance between the interment of a dead body, and its subsequent resurrection from beneath the ground, and the covering of a baptized person entirely with water, and the raising of him up again from beneath its surface. To others it has seemed very extraordinary, that a word, which in every other part of scripture implies the act of *pouring out from above*, should in this single expression have its meaning reversed, and be supposed to refer to an act of *immersing in water below*.*...

"It is our happiness to know, that our blessed Saviour never was finally interred. He died, however, for our sins, according to the

* Pages 110—113.

scriptures; and he was buried, and he rose again the third day, according to the scriptures.*...How then was he laid in a sepulchre? His body was not lowered into a grave and covered with earth: it was not laid under ground, but carried into a tomb, hewn out of a rock, not a sunk tomb.† The body of Christ, therefore, was not lowered, and rose up; but was carried in, and came forth. And what is said in scripture of his burial, can have no reference to final interment, but exclusively to preparatory rites.‡...

"Let us consider, ... the union with Christ in his burial, which is signified by our baptism. In our baptism we receive the figure of the washing of the body with pure water. This sacred office, we have seen, was performed to the dead body of Christ, when his disciples anointed it, that it might not see corruption, but be preserved in honour till the resurrection. The performance of it was an evidence of his death,—an emblem of separation from the pollutions of this world,—and a pledge of the abolishing of death, and bringing to light of life and incorruption. The union of believers with Christ, then, which is signified by baptism, is regeneration. Baptism is not, as some maintain, regeneration itself; but it is a figure of it, and the figure that teaches the necessity of the reality....

"This view of the meaning of our baptism is confirmed by Col. ii. 11—13, where baptism is declared to be circumcision....'The circumcision made without hands' is an expression which shows that the apostle did not mean that baptism was itself the spiritual blessing represented by the old circumcision; for baptism is performed by hands, as well as the old circumcision was. He meant that the one ordinance succeeded the other, because both had the same meaning. Whether it were by manual circumcision of old, or manual baptism now, the spiritual blessing signified is the product, not of human, but of divine agency; namely, regeneration.§...

"In treating of the connexion between the justification and the sanctification of believers, the apostle makes, in the beginning of the sixth chapter of the Romans, three distinct allusions to baptism, to grafting, and to crucifixion. It is the opinion of some, however, that in the second of these allusions he is still adverting to the ordinance of baptism; and so full of the idea of immersion do they become, on reading the fifth verse, that, besides supposing it to be intended in the foregoing verse, when it is said, 'we are buried with

* 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.
† Page 123.
‡ Pages 118, 124.
§ Pages 127, 128.

Christ by baptism,' they imagine the apostle is repeating it in the language of the 5th verse.*...

"The transplanting of the disciples of Christ, in consequence of their union with him, is their dying to sin and living to righteousness, with all that victory over the world at present, and all that final glory, which attends the happy change. They are grafted, or transplanted, together with him in the likeness of his death, and they shall be in the likeness of his resurrection.†...

"As in baptism there is a representation of death to sin, by a figure of washing, like that preparatory to interment, which took place in the burial of Christ; as in grafting, or transplanting, we have a figure of that change of state and character by which we have all connexion broken off with the circumstances of our former condition, that we may be one with Christ; so, in crucifixion, our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin may be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."‡

The Eighth Witness said, "The chief argument for immersion is taken from Rom. vi. 4, and Col, ii. 12.... Now, here let it be considered,—1. That the weight of the argument rests entirely upon the supposition that the apostle in these passages alludes to the mode of christian baptism, which can with no certainty be proved. For, 2. The apostle in both places may be justly understood as speaking, not concerning the external and ceremonial part of christian baptism, but concerning the internal and moral part; not concerning the application of water, which has no power to kill, or destroy 'the body of sin;' but concerning the regenerating influences of the Spirit; by which Spirit the scriptures often speak of christians as baptized; and by the influences of which Spirit, or in consequence of their baptism by which alone, it is that they are said 'to be dead:' 'dead with Christ;' 'dead to sin.' Now, as this Spirit only has power to kill, or destroy 'the old man,' (to use the apostle's phrase,) and to make us 'dead with Christ,' and 'dead to sin;' and as we are very frequently represented as 'baptized with this Spirit,' it is perfectly natural to understand the apostle as speaking of these internal and moral influences of the Spirit, when he tells christians that they were 'buried with Christ by baptism into death,' &c. And it is further observable, that we are, in this discourse of the apostle, as much said to be *crucified* and *circumcised* by

* Page 132. † Page 137. ‡ Page 139.

or with Christ, as we are to be *buried with him;* and *baptism* is as expressly termed the *circumcision of Christ*, or the christian circumcision, as a burial with Christ.*...

"Finally, should it be granted that these two texts, Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12, favour the mode of dipping, it must certainly be also allowed, that the several texts before cited do equally favour sprinkling or pouring in baptism; so that the matter may admit of an easy compromise, by supposing, that, as this christian ceremony undoubtedly had its origin, and was borrowed from the Jewish law, and as persons and things were purified, or set apart, under that law, sometimes by dipping, and sometimes by sprinkling, so the apostles performed this ceremonial purification in the Christian church, sometimes in one form, and sometimes in the other, as the circumstances of time, place, persons required.†...

"If, after all that hath been said, any still think it their indispensable duty to baptize by immersion only, let them by all means thus baptize; but then we beseech them to forbear all severe censures of those who are not dipt. Let them not represent us as persons unbaptized, withdraw from our churches, refuse communion with us at the common table of our Lord, upon so trifling a difference. This surely were to dishonour our sacred religion, and too naturally brings not only christian baptism, but christianity itself, into contempt."‡

"The only argument left for the advocates of immersion is," said the NINTH WITNESS, "the supposed allusion to the mode of baptism contained in Rom. vi. 3, 4. It is necessary, however, to quote the next verses also, which are dependent upon the foregoing. 'For if we have been PLANTED together,' still by baptism, 'in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man is CRUCIFIED with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin;' (verses 5, 7.) Why then do not the advocates of immersion go forward to these verses, so inseparably connected with those they are so ready to quote, and show us a resemblance, not only between baptism by immersion and being buried with Christ, but also between immersion and being 'planted with Christ'? If the allusion of the apostle is to the planting of a young tree in the earth, there is clearly but a very partial, not a total immersion in the

* Pages 108—111. † Page 113. ‡ Page 130.

case; and if it be to GRAFTING a branch upon a tree, the resemblance is still more imperfect. Still further, as the apostle, in the same connexion, speaks of our being 'CRUCIFIED with Christ,' and that also by baptism, why do they not show us how immersion in water resembles the nailing of a body to the cross?

"But this striking and important text is not to be explained by a fancied resemblance between a burial, as they choose to call it, of the body in water, and the burial of Christ; as if a dip or a plunge could have any resemblance to that separation from the living, and that laying aside of a body in the sepulchre, which burial implies. This forced thought darkens and enervates the whole passage, instead of bringing forth its powerful sentiments into clearer view. The manifest object of the apostle, in the whole of this part of his epistle, was to show, that the doctrine of justification by faith alone, which he had just been establishing, could not in any true believer lead to licentiousness of life. 'What then shall we say? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid; how shall we that are DEAD to sin live any longer therein?' The reason, then, which is given by the apostle why true believers CANNOT continue in sin, is that they are 'DEAD to sin,' which is his answer to the objection. Now this mystical death to sin, he proceeds to attribute to the INSTRUMENTALITY of baptism, taking it to be an act of that faith in Christ of which it was the external expression; and then he immediately runs into a favourite comparison, which, under various forms, occurs in his writings, sometimes accompanied with the same allusion to baptism, and sometimes referring only to 'faith' as the instrument; a comparison between the mystical death, burial, and resurrection of believers, and the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. This is the comparison of the text; not a comparison between our mystical death and baptism, nor between baptism and the death and burial of Christ, either of which lay wide of the apostle's intention. Baptism, as an act of faith, is in fact expressly made, not a *figure* of the effects which follow, as stated in the text, but the means of effecting them. 'Know ye not,' &c. We enter by this means into the experience of its efficacy in affecting a mystical death in us; in other words, we *die* with him, or, as is expressed in verse 6, 'our old man is crucified with him.' Still further, 'by baptism,'...*through*, or *by means* of baptism, 'we are BURIED with him;' we do not only die to sin and the world, but we are separated wholly from it, as the body of Christ was separated from the living

world when laid in the sepulchre; the connexion between sin, and the world, and us, is completely broken, as those who are buried and put out of sight are no longer reckoned among men; nay, as the slave (for the apostle brings in this figure also,) is by death and burial wholly put out of the power of his former master, so 'that we should not *serve* sin, for he that is dead is *freed* from sin.' But we also mystically RISE with him, that 'like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life,' having new connexions, new habits, new enjoyments, and new hopes. We have a similar passage in Col. ii. 12, and it has a similar interpretation; 'Buried with him in,' &c.; in the preceding verse the apostle had been speaking of the mystical *death* of christians, under the phrase 'putting off the body of the sins of the flesh;' then, as in the Epistle to the Romans, he adds our mystical BURIAL with Christ, which is a heightened representation of death; and then also our *rising* again with Christ. Here, too, all these three effects are attributed to baptism as the means. We *put off the body* of sins 'by the circumcision of Christ;' that is, as we have seen, by christian circumcision or baptism; we are buried with him by baptism, ἐν being obviously used here, like διὰ, to denote the instrument; and by baptism we rise with him to newness of life.

"Now, to institute a comparison between a mode of baptism, and the burial of Christ, wholly destroys the meaning of the passage; for how can the apostle speak of baptism as an *emblem* of Christ's burial, when he argues from it as the instrument of our *death* unto sin, and separation from it by a mystical burial? Nor is baptism here made use of as the emblem of our own spiritual death, burial, and resurrection. As an emblem, even immersion, though it might put forth a clumsy type of burial and rising again, is wanting in not being emblematical of *death;* and yet all three, our mystical death, burial, and rising again, are distinctly spoken of, and must all be found represented in some TYPE. But the TYPE made use of by the apostle is manifestly not baptism, but the death, burial, and resurrection of our Lord: and in this view he pursues this bold and impressive figure to even the verge of allegory, in the succeeding verses, 7—11 of Rom. vi."*

The TENTH WITNESS said, "It will be vain to plead, from Rom. vi.

* Pages 111—414.

3, 4, and Cor. ii. 12, that there must be a resemblance in baptism to a burial and resurrection, for where is the resemblance in their mode of dipping? A living person walks into the water till it reach his loins, and submits to be ducked by a minister; and is this like putting a dead body into the grave? Those who can see a resemblance here to the mode of burial either in Britain or Judea, must see as far as the man who made Pharaoh's horses ministers of the gospel. Besides, the burial alluded to in these passages is that of our blessed Lord, and how his body was laid in the sepulchre hewn out of a rock, neither you nor I can tell. We can only tell with certainty that it did not step down into this sepulchre, and that we have no reason to think it was deposited after the manner of dipping and therefore to talk of imitating in baptism what we know nothing about, but this, that we do not imitate it, is *very near akin to nonsense.*"*...

This passage, Rom. vi. 4, " is bomb-proof, according to the system of our opponents; and pray what does their meaning of words make it? Translate it and see; 'Know ye not that so many of us as were *dipped into* Jesus Christ, *were dipped* into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by *dipping into* death.' Alas! gentlemen, things grow worse and worse, the more you bring them to the test; and sure I am, if anything could put a man or a system to the blush, it must be such miserable murdering of the Word of God as this. Can they really look these passages in the face, (and they are the very pride of their party,) I say, can they really look them in the face, and say again, Βαπτιζω naturally signifies to dip, and εις naturally expresses the idea of into? If they can, there is only one thing more to be wondered at, and that is, how any man with their sentiments can maintain there is only *one mode* of baptism. For though we were to say nothing about *water* or *sand*, here they can prove from scripture that there is one mode of baptism which consists in *dipping into a name;* another, which consists in *dipping into Christ;* a third, which consists in *dipping into death;* and we found a fourth, which was performed by *dipping into Moses' body.* Now, let them follow out their principles, and furnish us with an example of them in real life, if this be practicable. I am certain the practice will do more for Pedobaptists than all the books that can be written on the subject. A few dippings *into death* will do the business, though they should try no other mode.†

* Page 24. † Page 37.

"But," gentlemen, "they cannot live according to what they profess. Their system is impracticable, and can exist only in theory. They cannot dip people into a name, into Christ, into death. The thing is impossible, and the idea is horrible! Only think in what figure and form of dress believers are made to appear by their murdering this text (Gal. iii. 27.) 'For as many of you as have been *dipped into Christ*, have put on Christ.' Besides, I must remark, that express and explicit commandment men, like our opponents, have no scriptural warrant for water baptism at all. It is not intended to deny that there was a command for using water in John's baptism (John i. 33,) nor yet that a duty may be inferred from scripture, as well as enjoined by an express command. Hence Pedobaptists think it sufficient that they have scriptural examples to warrant their using water in baptism. But this will not do for those who admit of nothing short of express and explicit command for positive institutes; such as say,...'*If revelation, in regard of positive institutes, be not express and implicit*, I see not how we can be obliged to observe them; a law in this case is in effect no law, and where there is no law there is no transgression.'... Although they 'demand from us an *express* and *explicit* command for infant baptism,' and say, '*to go beyond or come short of what is* expressly *and* explicitly *noted in the scriptures of truth, with respect to a positive institute, is to set aside the institution itself, and practise a human rite.*' Yet they do not remember that there is no such command for dipping *into water* in christian baptism, and therefore, on their own principles, if they dip into it, they set aside the institution itself, and practise a human rite. They have no command to dip into any thing but into a name. 'Go ye therefore and teach all nations, *dipping into the name*,' &c. They must therefore either renounce their own sentiments, published to the world, or renounce water baptism as an ordinance of God, and betake themselves to dipping into a name. This is their case, if consistency were their character, and this is a consequence resulting from their principles; that all of them who have been dipped *into water* are unbaptized, for they have only *been practising a human rite.*"*

* Pages 36—38.

On the foregoing clauses the reply of the Defendant's Counsel was as follows:—

Our opponents, gentlemen, manifest their enmity to the ordinance of the Testator by captiously asking why "we do not go forward to Rom. vi. 5, 6, and show the resemblance, not only between baptism and being buried with Christ, but also between baptism and being planted with him; and how baptism resembles the nailing of a body to the cross." These questions, gentlemen, come with a very bad grace from those who have not attempted to show, because they know well they cannot by any artifice show, in what respect the sprinkling or effusing an infant bears the least resemblance even to burying or rising again

Believers, gentlemen, being literally baptized in water into Jesus Christ, are figuratively baptized into his death; "therefore we are buried with him," &c. For if we have been planted in the likeness of his death, by being baptized, figuratively of dying unto sin, we shall be planted in the likeness of his resurrection, and "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ."* By virtue of a real *implantation* into Christ, by an operative and lively faith, we experience the power of Christ's death and resurrection, enabling us to die to sin, and live unto God, whereby we become "like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season."† And by subduing our corrupt desires, through the power of the Holy Spirit, with which we are baptized after being baptized with water, our old man is crucified with him. Paul says, "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."‡ In this passage the apostle implies, that as the Lord was crucified for him upon the cross, so he is figuratively crucified unto the world, and the world unto him; an expression equivalent to being baptized into his death. Thus we in measure rise above the temptations of the world, and are freed from the prejudices and traditions of men; as "he who is dead is freed from sin." It may be said of Paul that he lived a life of perpetuated crucifixion; he says himself, "I die daily."§ Being constantly

* 2 Peter iii. 18. † Psalm i. 3. ‡ Gal. vi. 14. § 1 Cor. xv. 31.

persecuted by the outwardly *pious* and *devout*, those who paid tithes "of mint, and anise, and cumming;" and were he now living among us, the same description of characters would, so far as their power of annoyance extended, still persecute him.

Now, gentlemen, in opposition to some of the evidence we have just heard, I will ask you, What in nature could be more emblematical of burial, than the body being covered over with water; or of death, than the body being so buried? Could a more striking emblem of death and burial be devised?

Rising again out of the water, represents, in the same striking manner, a resurrection "to newness of life." Thus, according to the apostle, "we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Must it not, gentlemen, be highly offensive to the Redeemer, to hear the ordinance which he commanded his disciples to preach, denominated by one for whom he suffered "a clumsy type of a burial and resurrection," and by another, "a far-fetched fancy"?

These Witnesses either are, or appear to be, wanting in sufficient knowledge to distinguish either between literal and metaphorical baptism, *i. e.*, between being baptized with water, and being baptized with the Holy Ghost; or between the circumcision of the flesh, and the circumcision of the heart—things of widely different import. When Paul had laid his hands upon those who had just come out of the water, "the Holy Ghost came on them."* In like manner, but without so visible an effect, all who are baptized in faith are afterwards baptized with the Spirit,† and are then, in scripture language, circumcised "with the circumcision made without hands." This circumcision Paul was circumcised with, and, so far as we read, he was the first and only man of those that had been circumcised with hands, who had been circumcised without hands, *i. e.*, who had been baptized of the Spirit previous to his being baptized in water.‡

Hence the wide difference between the circumcision of the flesh and that of the heart; and between circumcision and baptism. Equally wide is the difference, gentlemen, between the ordinance of baptism and the rite of sprinkling or pouring. I have before shown you that there is only ONE literal baptism: and what that one is, cannot, according to the Will, be disputed. Therefore, in accord-

* Acts xix. 6. † Acts ii. 38. ‡ Acts ix. 17, 18.

ance with the clauses before us, we are "buried with Christ in baptism," &c.

The ordinance of baptism, which in itself is only an outward sign or shadow, is a most important thing, seeing it was instituted of God, that his well-beloved Son "should be made manifest to Israel;"* and it was in the act of his coming up out of the water that he was made manifest. "The heavens opened, and the Spirit, like a dove, descended upon him; and there came a voice from heaven, saying, Thou art my well-beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."† This same ordinance the Testator himself established, and for a similar purpose, *i. e.*, that all believers should be made manifest by it, under a promise that they should also be baptized with the Holy Ghost.‡ Therefore the ordinance is, in all its bearings, a mighty benefit: for it is by this ordinance alone that a believer can be introduced into the church of God, in which church only there is undoubted and everlasting safety.§ All this is beautifully and clearly exhibited by the texts before us; "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death." "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death,"—figurative of dying to the world, its temptations and its sins,—"that like as Christ was raised up from the dead...even so we also should walk in newness of life." Therefore, as certainly as Christ was raised up from the dead "by the glory of the Father," so every believer, in coming up out of the water, emblematical of rising with him from the dead, is for ever "freed (or justified) from sin,"‖ and enters upon a new life; which "life is hid with Christ in God."¶ These things are repeated,** but with a little variation in the wording of them. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Here, gentlemen, you observe that we rise with him by the same baptism by which we were buried with him; and are assured that we, who were "dead in our sins and the uncircumcision of our flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven us all trespasses;" "blotting out the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross." Thus, as baptism is a figure of the death, burial, and rising again of Christ, it is also a figure of the believer's death to sin, of his burial, and of his rising again with him, who "was deli-

* John i. 31. † Mark i. 11. ‡ Matt. iii. 11; Acts i. 5; ii. 38.
§ Acts ii. 47. ‖ Verse 7. ¶ Col. iii. 3. ** Col. ii. 12. 14.

vered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification."* So the believer, by following, in a figurative manner, his Lord,† and arming himself "with the same mind,"‡ rises again to newness of life, in the likeness of his resurrection.§ And thus is he "justified from sin," as the Testator, in the most emphatic language, says; "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." ‖

"But some man will say, How are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die."¶ Do not these texts contradict the received opinion of the world, that man is immortal? Add to which, it is said of the Most High, "who ONLY hath immortality." And again, "this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."** Now, permit me to ask, if we were born incorruptible and immortal, how could we put on incorruptibility and immortality? Could we put on the self same things which we had on already? O, but it will be replied, It is the body only that is mortal. Well, observe what is said, Gen. ii. 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Here the whole man is expressed by the word soul; and when God shall take away that breath, that soul, according to the original sentence, "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return,"†† dies. Paul says, "Behold, I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed."‡‡ We shall not all rest in the grave, but shall be changed from being mortal to being immortal. Enoch and Elijah underwent this change, and the change was as much death as if their bodies had lain in the grave until the resurrection.§§

How many thousands of cases are there, where the soul, or the better part of man, dies before the body; as when the man becomes childish, knowing nothing — when his life is only a sort of vegetable existence.

* Rom. iv. 25. † John xii. 26. ‡ 1 Peter iv. 1.
§ See also 1 Peter iii. 21. ‖ John xii. 24.
¶ 1 Cor. xv. 35, 36. See also to the end of verse 50. ** 1 Cor. xv. 53.
†† Gen. iii. 19. ‡‡ 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.
§§ See Ps. lxxxix. 48; 1 Cor. xv. 22.

I have heard it denied that the punishment of Adam's sin was visited upon him according to his sentence, because he did not die on the day he fell; but it does not follow, "because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily," that that sentence becomes void. On that day the seed of death was planted in him: from that day he began to die. Apologising for the digression, I shall proceed.

The Witnesses, gentlemen, by way of throwing dust in your eyes, assert that the Testator was never finally interred. They also ask how he was laid in the sepulchre, and where is the likeness of being let down under water and rising again out of it, and the carrying of a body by a lateral door into a cavern, and that body reviving and coming forth by the same door. They tell you that the body of Christ was not laid under ground, but carried into a tomb — not a sunk tomb — that, therefore, it was not lowered and raised up, but was carried and came forth. These wily assertions, questions, and statements, are foreign from the texts. The allusions in them are to the burial and rising again of our Lord; not to the place or manner of interment. Paul affirms that he was buried, and that he rose again.* This is sufficient for our cause, and crushes their specious endeavours to oppugn it.

In short, gentlemen, believers show their oneness in Christ,† by that baptism which typifies their death, their resurrection, their crucifixion, and their being planted with him. This momentous union cannot be experienced by those who reject the only ordinance that shadows it forth. How, then, can they be expected to speak scripturally on a subject which they have yet to learn? Would it not be well for these Witnesses to study Eccles. vii. 12, in order to try how far they can appropriate that text to themselves.

You will recollect, gentlemen, that the First Witness, fearful of committing the Plaintiffs, spoke very cautiously on the first of these clauses, saying, "It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion." Is using the word *probable* any proof of his not having studied the Bible to confirm the articles of a preconceived creed? No! Still, on the second clause, he makes amends for it, by asserting, without doubt or reservation, that the words, "buried with him by baptism," &c., allude to the baptism, whereby the person baptized appears to be buried under

* 1 Cor. xv. 4. † John xvii. 20—24.

water, as Christ was buried in the earth; his rising again, and emerging from the water, was an emblem of the resurrection of the body; and further, that baptism was, by the early christians, considered also as an emblem of their natural death and rising again. Behold, gentlemen, another, and a most important point, which we came here to defend, absolutely surrendered to us, and that by the Plaintiffs' leading Witness.

Now, gentlemen, I beg to call your attention to the difference between the evidence of the Second Wituess and that of the First. The first spoke doubtingly on the former clause, and positively on the latter; while the Second spoke incongruously on the latter, and positively on the former. If putting converts under water, when they made a profession of faith, was the ancient manner of receiving them into the church, the administration must still be the same, as it cannot be yea in one age and nay in another; for though we denominate it the ancient manner, it was in fact the manner of the church in its youthful state. And, "whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever; nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it."* Can man, then, by sprinkling an unconscious being, vitiate the ordinance of God, and be held guiltless? Those Jews who first became christians were wiser than those who now style themselves such. They knew the difference between the typical and the true people of God, and that infants could not be numbered among the latter.

This Witness says, that circumcision was an ordinance for the children of believing Jews; but where, it may be asked, does he get his information? Not from the Will; for, according to that, they were at some periods, with few exceptions, all unbelievers. Witness when they were about to enter the promised land; there were only two, Caleb and Joshua, among all those that were numbered. In the days of Jeremiah, also, there was not one to be found in Jerusalem.† Yet all the children were circumcised; an evident proof that the circumcision of the child was not dependent on the faith of the parent. The statement of this Witness consequently falls to the ground. Yet the Jews, unbelievers as they were, had respect to circumcision, as being commanded of God. But those who now denominate themselves Christians have no such respect for baptism, notwithstanding it was commanded by him who said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And what

* Eccl. iii. 14. † Jer. v. 1.

man can see it, while he sets the Testator's commission at defiance? As for an infant being born again, it is a thing utterly at variance with the whole tenor of the Will; and at variance, also, with the opinion of most men, except with the disciples of that worse than any "heathenish superstition," baptismal regeneration. And does not the Witness feel it at variance with his own opinion, when he says "positively" of baptism, that "it is the answer of a good conscience towards God; the faithful answer of a resolved soul, in the covenant of baptism, who gives up himself to the obedience of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and renounces the world, the flesh, and the devil." And can these things be, in any, the most remote way, applied to infants? Can they make the answer of a good conscience? Can they who know neither the world, the flesh, nor the devil, renounce them; they who come into the world, like their Redeemer, pure?

If the Third Witness had said, there is no other way, except by baptism, by which a believer can, in the first place, testify his new birth; no other way by which he can enter into the kingdom of heaven; we could have joined hands with him. But as he hath said, that by the mere "ministration of baptism," and in baptism exclusively, individuals are born anew, we must oppose him to the death. To affirm this, is to affirm that we are regenerated by virtue of the water only; thus making the word of God and the blood of Christ of none effect. Can a babe, gentlemen, be dead in sins? No: "Where no law is, there is no transgression." It is those who are willingly ignorant of the Will — those who have it, and refuse to abide by its requirements — those who contemn its commandments, and who say, and teach others to believe, that "no other than baptismal regeneration is to be expected in this world" — those it is that are dead in sins, and must remain so, until they turn to the Lord, and look up to him who only opens the heart and quickens the dead.

The Fourth Witness, in his cross-examination, made it clear that he knew what the words crucifixion and circumcision meant literally, and also how they were employed metaphorically; and yet, in the text, there is "no allusion to the outward manner of their performance." Must we not, then, presume that he knew also what the word "baptism" meant literally, as used in this text, and how it was employed metaphorically in others? If he had spoken with the same candour on the meaning of the latter word as he did upon that of each of the former ones, he would, in his own unmeaning words,

have declared that nothing but "baptism *performed by immersion*" could typify our being buried with Christ, and rising again to newness of life. Now, gentlemen, how can the sign apply to a new-born infant? Can a being which has scarcely begun to live a natural life, live to newness of life? Ananias said to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Does the sprinkling (pouring this Witness never practises) of an innocent, unconscious being, show any resemblance to the *chief of sinners* being typically washed from his sins, by being plunged in water? This Witness, gentlemen, must first bring proof that, under the old dispensation, the same inward change had been signified by the circumcision of adult proselytes and their infant offspring, as is signified by the baptism of a believer, before you can give credence to his assertion that "no argument can be adduced from these clauses against the baptism of infants." It is evident he could adduce none in favour of it, or he would have adduced it.

"Our antagonists," says the Fifth Witness, "are bound to show that this figurative expression (in verse 5), which refers to the same thing, does not as strictly signify the mode in which baptism is received as the word buried." To show this, gentlemen, does not appear very difficult; for the expression refers to the consequence of the act, not to the manner of its administration. You are aware that the words were addressed to those who understood them: to such "they are all plain."* To those who had already been baptized,—to those who were familiar with their figurative bearing,—the apostle shews, in the 3d and 4th verses, that their being put under water was figurative of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and of their dying, being buried, and rising again with him; and then says, "If we have been planted (by baptism) together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection;" *i. e.*, being buried, we are planted with him, "the root," and we, the branches, shall spring up with, and grow like him;† who will, in the end, "change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body."‡

It happened, gentlemen, a short time ago, in a town in this neighbourhood, that a plain person went, together with most of the dissenting ministers of the place, to hear a stranger, who was esteemed by the world as a highly talented preacher. Upon being asked how he liked his preaching, the plain man replied, "The

* Prov. viii. 9. † 1 John iii. 2. ‡ Phil. iii. 21.

Almighty commanded Moses to set the brazen serpent upon a bare pole, that every one who was bitten might look up to it and live; but this man, by his blandishment, flowery language, and multiplicity of words, although he carried the congregation along with him, set the serpent in the midst of a luxuriant tree, so that it was wholly hidden from sight by the foliage." Thus it is, gentlemen, with

The Sixth Witness; he, after the same manner, endeavours to hide the truth. But as he appears to have some compunction of conscience, occasioned by the indirect and laboured way in which he treats the subject; and as he has acknowledged, in pretty plain terms, that he does not understand it; we shall leave him to the operation of his convictions, which may perhaps produce in him a salutary effect, simply reminding him, that "there is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."* You observed, gentlemen, that on these clauses he only argued for the "mode," not for the "subjects," of baptism. And why was this? Because he cannot make the clauses and the christening of infants agree. We have previously shown, that the clauses in question have an important and distinctive meaning; it would, therefore, be unnecessary to notice them again. This Witness is at variance with most of the other Witnesses, as each of them is with himself. According to his own declaration, then, as before observed, "there must be unsoundness in the whole theory, where there are such differences amongst its advocates." He allows "baptism to be the converts' first declaration of faith; and that they are spoken of as in baptism washing away their sins, and putting on Christ." Well then, gentlemen, is it not as contrary to the Will as it is opposed to common sense, to regard "washing away" and sprinkling as synonymous terms; or to regard an infant as capable of making a declaration of faith? "Were there more," he has said elsewhere, quoting Isa. lxvi. 2, "of this trembling at the word of God, there would be much less difficulty in settling many a question of controversy. I can conceive of nothing more preposterous, than for the professed servants of Christ to be squandering their powers of invention and ratiocination in devising and vindicating plans of their own."† To this, gentlemen, your patience will bear true testimony. He makes a difference between the expressions, buried

* Prov. xiv. 12.

† National Church Establishments Examined, pages 40. 16.

with him *in* baptism, and buried with him *by* baptism. But what says his brother, the

Seventh Witness? "In both passages the expression seems to have the same import, and contains an allusion to our Lord's burial, and our being buried with him by baptism into his death." Now, gentlemen, I cannot conceive that these passages are less plain to the men of the present day than they were to the people to whom they were first written. Nay, they are plainer, seeing that the Will was not then completed, as it is now; and seeing, also, that its contents "are all plain to him that understandeth, and right to them that find knowledge."* It ought, therefore, to be studied as if it were the production of yesterday. "The Lord changes not."† "With him there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."‡ Whence, then, does "this scriptural illustration now require fresh illustration"? Is it not that the progenitors of the Plaintiffs have deviated from the true scriptural line, and that their descendants follow on in their path? And is it not a natural consequence, that the further they proceed in that direction, the greater will be the divergence? Thus, as the prophet Isaiah expresses it, having "transgressed the laws, changed the ordinance, and broken the everlasting covenant,"§ they are endeavouring to make the allusions contained in these passages square with their own imaginations; contrary to the advice of the apostle, "Be not wise in your own conceits."‖

We agree with those who think that baptism and immersion are synonymous terms. This Witness himself, in his Greek Lexicon, has shown that they are. The simple act may be a mockery in one case, and in another valid baptism. An unbeliever may be baptized, but not in the scriptural sense of the word: on the contrary, he makes himself, by the act, "two-fold more the child of hell" than he was before, because he makes a false profession.¶ But when a believer is baptized, he is inducted into the church, and becomes a genuine follower and disciple of Christ. Strictly speaking, according to the true import of the word, it applies to a believer only. Witness what Paul said, on finding certain people whom he supposed to be disciples, because they had been baptized; "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Thus showing that they were ignorant of the import of the ordinance. But after

* Prov. viii. 9. † Mal. iii. 6. ‡ James i. 17.
§ Isa. xxiv. 5. ‖ Rom. xii. 16. ¶ Acts viii. 13—23.

they had been taught of Paul, they were baptized, "according to the true definition of the word." "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them."* Thus proving that the baptism of an unbeliever is not only a nullity, but a gross perversion of the ordinance, and consequently a heinous sin. This Witness allows that all the "allusions of scripture are admirably correct." Well would it be for him, if he would keep this truth in remembrance, that he might not, by wresting them, subject himself to the reproof, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"†

This Witness correctly states, that baptism is a figure of our regeneration. For it is by this ordinance that believers figuratively enter into that life which continueth for ever, and are thus added to that body, the church, of which the First-born from the dead is the head—the beginning. As it is manifest, therefore, that no unbaptized person can be added to the church on earth,‡ must it not be equally so that he cannot be added to it hereafter?§ And seeing he has not been inducted into it here, how is it possible he can, according to Eph. v. 27, be hereafter presented to Christ as a member of his glorious church? But it is wrong to state that the apostle, in the texts before us, makes an allusion to grafting. The allusion he makes is to planting, which is a very different operation. "To others," says this Witness, "it has seemed very extraordinary, that a word which in every other part of the scripture implies the act of pouring out from above, should in this single expression have its meaning reversed, and be supposed to refer to an act of immersing in water below." Gentlemen, does our Lord's going down into the water to be baptized, or John baptizing in Ænon, because there was much water there, or the eunuch going down into the water, imply the act of pouring out from above?

With regard to the Eighth Witness, whatever he may affirm, you, gentlemen, are conscious that the apostle is speaking of literal baptism, baptism in water, as figurative of the believer being buried, and rising again with Christ; not of the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which none that search the Will for instruction can confound with it. Water, he says, hath no power to kill or destroy the body of sin. True, it has not; but the question is, Can sin be pardoned independent of it? Again he says, and truly, that it is by the

* Acts xix. 4—6.
† Luke vi. 46.
‡ See Acts ii. 47.
§ Eccles. xi. 3.

influence of the Spirit only that we are dead with Christ. But when is it that we are blessed with this influence, as promised of the Father?* Is it not after we are, according to the text, baptized into his death? As Peter says to the Jews, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for* the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." This Witness, by his manner of expression, gives you clearly to understand that he verily believes that both texts "*favour the mode of dipping.*" Until he bring proof that baptism was borrowed from the Jewish law, you must pay no attention to his arguments drawn from that law, nor to his assertion that the apostles sometimes baptized and sometimes sprinkled their converts. The latter is in direct opposition to the apostle Paul, who declares that there is only ONE baptism. Paul preached ONE gospel only, and said to the Galatians, If "an angel from heaven preach any other gospel,...let him be accursed."† And what, gentlemen, is the gist of the evidence you have heard, but the preaching of another gospel? This Witness hints at a compromise between the Plaintiffs and Defendants, as if man could take the law of God into his own hands, and save himself on his own terms.

Now, gentlemen, this compromise is no new idea. It was advocated by a brother leader of the sect of this Witness a century ago; as I shall show by reading the following extract from a publication lying before me. "The Doctor said to me (Dr. Gibbons) that he had sometimes thought of a compromise with our Baptist brethren, by their giving up their mode of baptism, immersion, on their own side, and our giving up the baptism of infants on the other; as he had not observed any benefit arising from the administration of the ordinance to them. This was the whole, from what I remember, the Doctor said upon the point, which in my opinion falls much short of a declaration from him that he wished infant baptism to be laid aside....Dr. Watts, it appears, would have conceded the baptism of *infants*, if the other party would have given up the immersion of adults."‡

Now, gentlemen, I think you will agree with me that if this Witness and his constituents had any confidence in their own creed, they would not quail and lament as they do in the presence of this

* Luke xxiv. 49. † Gal. i. 8.

‡ Life, Times, and Correspondence of the Rev. Dr. Isaac Watts, by the Rev. Thomas Milner, D.D., M.A., page 496.

Court; neither would they beseech us to forbear all severe censures; nor beg of us,—us, who are "hated of all nations,"—not to reproach them as being unbaptized; nor would they endeavour to persuade us not to forbid their communion with us, on what they call such "a trifling difference." No! their piteous appeals originate in doubt, or rather in the certainty that they are in error. If they were confident in the righteousness of their cause, they would rather pity our state, commiserate our inflexibility, and openly declare that our profession is so unscriptural as to render us unworthy of having communion with them. Thus would they show themselves "bold as a lion."* Peter and John "spake the word of God with boldness, and the multitude of them that believed were of ONE heart and of ONE soul."† There were no concessions with them, gentlemen; no two baptisms preached; no attempt at conciliation by compromise! No, it is only our opponents that have recourse to these things; men who preach another gospel—men who, to judge from their own admissions, are "willingly ignorant," and compass sea and land to make others like themselves—men who may be compared to the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin, in the days of Ezra, who came to "Zerubbabel and to the chief of the fathers, and said unto them, Let us build with you, for we seek your God as ye do, and we do sacrifice unto him....But Zerubbabel, and Jeshua, and the rest of the chief of the fathers of Israel said unto them, You have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God; but we ourselves together will build unto the Lord God of Israel....Then the people of the land weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building; and hired counsellors against them to frustrate their purpose."‡ So also do our opponents. We do not suffer them to build with us; they therefore do their utmost to retard and mar our work, although they know it is not in their power to frustrate it.

"You will recollect, gentlemen, that this Witness said, at the beginning of his evidence, that the water of baptism is an emblematical figure, and was intended to represent some spiritual blessing, which is spoken of in the Old Testament as sprinkled or poured out; and that if Βαπτιζω will at all admit of the sense, then it is perfectly agreeable to the analogy of scripture to administer it by sprinkling or pouring. But, gentlemen, as I have often before proved to you, there is no analogy between those two words and

* Prov. xxviii. 1. † Acts iv. 31, 32. ‡ Ezra iv. 1—5.

immersion, and no twisting or wresting can make them represent, as it does, the things mentioned in the texts before us. It is therefore unscriptural to apply them either to child or man. Indeed, the application is worse than useless — it is a rebellious act — a changing of the ordinance of God.* And you must allow me to detain you, gentlemen, while I read a few extracts from a periodical published by a leading member of the sect of this Witness,—(it is a quotation, but having neither note nor comment, it must be regarded as meeting his approbation,)—in order to point out to you what in his opinion a christian ordinance ought to be; and although he uses a word not to be found in the scriptures, you will be at no loss to know what he means by it.

"A rite, in order to be regarded as a sacrament of Christ, must be characterised by *significancy* and *appropriateness*. It must not be an idle ceremony. It must have a meaning; an important meaning; and this meaning must be sufficiently obvious to be understood; otherwise it could hardly be regarded as an institution of Christ. Who could believe that Christ would appoint an ordinance in the church that was without meaning, or the meaning of which was so obscure and recondite as to be calculated rather to puzzle and perplex his people, than to instruct and edify them?...

"An outward rite, in order to be a sacrament of the church, must be one of *universal* and *perpetual obligation*. It must not be confined to the apostolic age, or to any other age. It must not be restricted to the Jews, or to any other people. Christianity was designed, and is adapted, to become the religion of the world. The christian dispensation is not to give place to any other dispensation, but is to continue to the end of time. Hence those rites of our religion which are entitled to be regarded as sacraments, being once instituted, are to remain. They are not to be superseded or done away; they are to be observed whenever and wherever the Church of Christ is established. They are to prevail with the religion of Christ all over the earth, and continue to the end of the world."

It is abundantly evident, gentlemen, from what we have heard in court, that the different sects which these Witnesses represent, are neither satisfied with themselves, nor with each other. And it would be marvellous if they were, so long as a voice remains to disturb their seeming tranquillity. None of them can read with attention the narratives of the numerous believers that were bap-

* Isa. xxiv. 5. † Evangelical Magazine for July, 1844, p. 331.

tized, as recorded in the Will, and not feel "convicted by their own conscience."*

The time is approaching, when the spurious charity which is now so fast spreading shall materially operate to kill the Witnesses; then those that are living "shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and shall send gifts one to another, because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt on the earth."†

Gentlemen, we build our faith on the testimony of the Testator and his apostles, and we use no terms of harsher sound than those which are derived from the same source. If the Will declares, and it does declare,‡ that all who depart from its plain and positive precepts forfeit all claim to its bequests, we dare not encourage the hope that the Testator will hold such guiltless, when the Lord declares that he will "remember their iniquity, and visit their sins."§ I have already read to you a quotation to the following effect, and I repeat it, "that the apostolic epistles contain numerous passages, which, if they were to be used by a modern controversialist, would be branded as most intolerant, most uncharitable, and most exclusive."

The Ninth Witness, gentlemen, reverses the order of the clauses, and makes the reality the type; although he allows, yet in a very irreverent manner, that immersion may be a type of burial and rising again. And, as I have before said, I cannot see what can be more emblematical of death and burial, than the body being put under water. The believer does indeed die "the common death;" but "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,"‖ he lives again, and that an eternal life. It is only the unbeliever that dies "a second death;" he who by "turning things upside down,"¶ perverts the gospel of Christ. What does this Witness mean by baptism not being "an emblem of spiritual death?" Is there any such thing as spiritual death? Does not a man that is born of the Spirit, in scriptural language, "live for ever"? "Whosoever," says the Testator, "liveth and believeth in me shall never die."** Baptism is an emblem of the death of the old man; not of the death of the christian; and rising again out of the water is an emblem of spiritual life in the new man, who then, but not before, becomes a christian, and can never die. The unbeliever, in scriptural language, is already dead, and never can live again, unless he repent and

* John viii. 9. † Rev. xi. 10. ‡ See Heb. iii. 7—12. § See Jer. xiv. 10.
‖ 1 Cor. xv. 52. ¶ Isa. xxix. 16. ** John xi. 26.

believe the gospel. That this Witness, by a multitude of words, endeavours to confound you, is manifest. Therefore my remarks on the evidence of the Sixth Witness will well apply to him.

The Tenth Witness turns the commission of the Testator into ridicule, and treats the subject in a manner so profane, that I am at a loss for terms sufficiently reprehensible of his conduct. Yet he shows by his soreness, and by denominating baptizing "*ducking*," that he inwardly writhes to hear his own creed controverted. Nevertheless, I shall follow the advice which Solomon gives, "Answer not a fool according to his folly, lest thou also be like unto him;"* and who also says, "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil."†

* Prov. xxvi. 4. † Eccl. viii. 11.

ON CHRISTIAN COMMUNION.

FURTHER EXAMINATION OF THE WITNESSES.

The Counsel for the Defendants rose, and said—

The Plaintiffs, gentlemen, have now adduced all the evidence they are able to adduce, and it is for you to try "of what sort it is." The general reluctance of their Witnesses to speak the whole truth has been manifested to the Court. And can we wonder at this reluctance, seeing that they are sensible their claim cannot bear investigation? I know, gentlemen, that the ordinance of baptism is a subject they would at any time rather avoid than discuss. Indeed, I have heard it remarked outside these doors, by some of the Plaintiffs, that they were "heartily sick" of the discussion, and that they wished for a compromise, which would lay it for ever at rest; and we are constrained to admit that there are many who profess themselves Baptists, who have to their shame, at the expense of their profession, readily acceded to the proposed wish. Of this the "great" (as I have heard him called,) Robert Hall, was a remarkable instance; but a man who has done greater injury to the "doctrine of Christ," has not lately lived, seeing that he was the most strenuous advocate for what is called open communion, and was "considered as standing in the very first rank among the Nonconformists of the present day;"* while "the weight of his character, and the authority of his name, render error from his pen trebly dangerous."† So true is this remark, that he is now quoted by many who call themselves Baptists, as an authority for their embracing the error; an error which, by the condemnation pronounced in the scriptures on those who identified themselves with the ungodly, by the praise bestowed upon those who did not, and by the commands and instructions of the gospel, I shall show to be offensive to God.

* See his works, by Dr. Gregory, vol. 3, page 179. † Ibid., 182.

It was said to Jehoshaphat, "Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord? Therefore there is wrath upon thee from before the Lord. Nevertheless there are good things found in thee, in that thou hast taken away the groves out of the land, and hast prepared thy heart to seek God."*

And also to the angel of the church of Ephesus; "I know thy works, and thy labour, and thy patience; and how thou canst not bear them which are evil; and thou hast tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and hast found them liars....Nevertheless, I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love. ...But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitanes, which I also hate."†

And also to the church in Pergamos; "I know thy works, and where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is; and thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith....But I have a few things against thee, because thou hast there them that hold the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling-block before the children of Israel....So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, which thing I hate. Repent, or else I will come unto thee quickly, and will fight against them with the sword of my mouth."‡

And also to the "angel of the church in Thyatira; "I know thy works, and charity, and service, and faith, and thy patience, and thy works; and the last to be more than the first. Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, which calleth herself a prophetess, to teach and to seduce my servants to commit fornication,§ and to eat things sacrificed to idols....Behold I will cast her into a bed, and them that commit adultery with her into great tribulation, except they repent of their deeds."‖

And John, writing to the elect lady, says, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine (the doctrine of Christ), receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed. For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."¶

Robert Hall did "worse than" the Plaintiffs even; they do not, or profess not to, permit the unchristened to commune with them;

* 2 Chron. xix. 2, 3. † Rev. ii. 2—6. ‡ Rev. ii. 13—16.

§ See the meaning of the latter word, Exod. xxxiv. 15.

‖ Rev. ii. 19—22; see also Rev. ii. 8. 10; iii. 8—12.

¶ 2 John 10, 11. See Exod. xxxiii. 16; Numb. xxiii. 10; Ezra ix. 2. 12.

their churches, consequently, consist of one sect only, those whom *they* deem baptized; while he, according to his biographer, Dr. Gregory, had in his church at Broadmead three sects; one consisting of those who had been baptized when adult, which he called his *Baptist* church; these were strict communionists; another, of those who had been baptized when adult, but who were open communionists; and a third, of Pedobaptists; the last two communed together.* To these, according to his own declaration,† may be added another sect, viz., those who have not been christened at all. Gentlemen, was not this a heterogeneous mixture truly unique; a mixture such as is described in the latter part of the 2nd verse of the 18th chapter of the Revelation? Still he asks,‡ "In what respect, then, are we guilty of dispensing with divine laws? Merely because we are incapable of perceiving that an involuntary mistake on the subject (baptism) disqualifies for christian communion."

But what says the apostle Paul; "Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints...I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment."§ This reproof of the Corinthians, because there were divisions and heresies among them,‖ clearly shows that, in order to a scriptural celebration of the supper, all who assemble at the Lord's table must be "in the unity of the faith," since there is but "one Lord, one faith, one baptism."¶ Unity, then, between those who have been baptized in faith, and those who have not been so baptized, *is impossible.*** Robert Hall, like Apollos, was an eloquent man; and if he, like Apollos, had submitted himself to be taught by some humble, believing craftsman and his believing wife, he also might have known "the way of God more perfectly.††

There are others who do not concede so much as Robert Hall, but who nevertheless regard the Pedobaptists, and address them, as brethren, taking for their authority Paul's command to the Thessalonians,‡‡ "Count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." But they either disregard, or do not perceive, that the

* See his works, vol. 5, page 564.
† His works, vol. ii. pages 260, 261.
‡ Vol. ii. page 69.
§ 1 Cor. i. 2. 10.
‖ 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19.
¶ Eph. iv. 5.
** See Gen. iii. 15.
†† Acts xviii. 26.
‡‡ 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15.

command alluded to one who had been baptized, and scripturally inducted into the church, "which is in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ."*

Others, again, take the authority for their union from Mark ix. 38—40; "John answered him, saying, Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and he followeth not us, and we forbad him, because he followeth not us. But Jesus said, Forbid him not, for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part." If this man had been one of the true disciples of Christ, the apostles would doubtless have known it, as Paul knew the twelve at Ephesus not to have been,† and they would have acknowledged him as such. Or could a man in whom the spirit of Christ did not dwell, perform an actual miracle? It is clear, from Acts xix. 13, that there were at that time "certain of the vagabond Jews exorcists;" and it is supposed that these vagabonds obtained a livelihood by their exorcisms, while, according to the 19th verse, there were many of them. And may it not be alike clear also, that they were common in our Lord's day, and that it was of them he spoke, in Matt. xii. 27, when he answered the Pharisees, "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges," *i. e.*, If I cast them out by the means which you say, by what other means can your children cast them out? therefore they, by acknowledging that their "curious arts" were wrought by the power of Beelzebub,‡ shall be your judges. Our Lord's answer to John can hardly imply more than if he had said, that, seeing this exorcist even, to favour his delusive practices, pretends to do a miracle in my name, he does virtually acknowledge my power, which the majority of the Jews deny, or he would disparage his own pretensions. And thus, for the time being, he will be an instrument to extend my name. "Therefore forbid him not!" So far as acknowledging the Lord's power, the man was on his part. But our Lord says,§ "He that is not with me is against me;" *i. e.*, He who is not hearty against the common enemy, in support of my holy cause, is against me; and "he that gathereth not with me, scattereth abroad." A metaphor taken from shepherds. "He who does not help the true Shepherd to gather his flock into the fold, is most likely one who wishes to scatter them, that he may singly destroy them." And this shows that there is no medium between

* 1 Thess. i. 1. † Acts xix. ‡ See Acts xix. 19. § Matt. xii. 30.

loving the Lord and being his enemy; between strict obedience to his commandments, and positive rebellion; between openly, avowedly, and scripturally maintaining his cause, and the actual dislike to, or desertion of, his service.* If the man mentioned in Mark ix. 38, were not an impostor, I do not see how we can reconcile the passage with that of Matt. xii. 30,† for the spirit of consistency is the life of the gospel.

But can any one of our opponents suppose that either of the passages,‡ however scripturally explained, can favour their cause? or do they really believe, that the Testator will approve of their junction, or be bound by their act? No: when "the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch."

Hearken, gentlemen, to the "observation" the Fourth Witness has made on Matt. ix. 11, 12: "We," he said, "must not associate with ungodly men, out of love to their vain conversation: but we may, from good-will to their souls. We should, however, remember that our good Physician had the power of healing inherent in him, and was in no danger of taking infection; but it is not so with us: we should therefore consider our own constitution, so to speak, and not needlessly go into unwholesome air; lest, in attempting to do good to others, we get injury to ourselves. Let us rather enquire whether we have discovered our sickness, and have learned to value our Physician, and to follow his directions. For there are yet many stout-hearted Pharisees, who are whole in their own estimation, and are more disposed to carp at his words and works, than to wait on him for the healing of their souls."

Gentlemen, the commandment to the people of God to come out from among the ungodly,§ naturally implies that, having done so, they are not to return to them. That they are not to be like those who, after "their own lusts, heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears;" who "turn away their ears from the truth;"‖ but they are to avoid the snares set for them, remembering that they cannot join in worship with preachers and hearers whose doctrines are known to be unscriptural, no matter how amiable their private characters may be, or however uprightly they may appear to walk, without so far making themselves consenting parties to their doctrines. They must consider whether such worship can be pleasing

* See Exod. xxxii. 26; Deut. vi.; 1 Kings xviii. 21; 1 John iv. 2, 3; Rev. iii. 15.
† See also Matt. vii. 21—23. ‡ 2 Thess. iii. 14, 15, or Mark ix. 38. 40.
§ 2 Cor. vi. 17. ‖ 2 Tim. iv. 3, 4.

to their heavenly Father,—to him who hath said to the wicked people of Israel, "A son honoureth his father, and a servant his master; if then I be a father, where is mine honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests, that despise my name. And ye say, Wherein have we despised thy name? Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the Lord is contemptible. And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if ye offer the lame and sick, is it not evil? Offer it now unto thy governor: will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts."* Such worship gentlemen, cannot be acceptable to God, who said also, "The backsliding Israel hath justified herself more than treacherous Judah;"† although the former was wholly given up to idolatry, and the latter still continued to worship in the temple, but "feignedly," or "in falsehood." Under such teaching, the christian may hear a text scripturally explained, and may receive information from it; but that is no excuse for a breach of duty. If, by distance, he is separated from the Lord's people, he ought rather to remain at home, and study the scripture for himself. For however solitary he may be, he must bear in mind that "to obey is better than sacrifice;"‡ that to worship with those who change the ordinance of Christ is not sacrifice, but disobedience of the worst description: a chaste virgin cannot assemble with adulterers, and her virtue remain untarnished. All sin is hateful to God; but no sin is so hateful as false worship.§ False worship is, indeed, the antitype to idolatry—to the worship of other gods. Read the thirteenth chapter of Deuteronomy, and observe the dreadful punishment denounced upon it; a punishment, the infliction of which was imperative on the nearest relatives of the offending individuals. David committed a most heinous sin, in the case of Uriah and Bathsheba, for which he was punished during the remainder of his days. But it was intimated to him, immediately after he had committed it, that eternal punishment should not succeed to his guilt.‖ Yet this same David had the testimony that he was "a man after" God's "own heart."¶ And the reason he had this testimony is given, "Because David did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, and turned not aside from

* Mal. i. 6—8; see also Isa. lxv. 2—5; Jer. vi, 20; Ezek. xiii.
† Jer. iii. 11. ‡ 1 Sam. xv. 22. § See Deut. iv. 14—28.
‖ 2 Sam. xii. 1—14. ¶ Acts xiii. 22.

any thing he commanded him, all the days of his life, save only in the matter of Uriah the Hittite."* He never departed from the pure worship of God.†

But let us enquire, gentlemen, What is "AN INVOLUNTARY MISTAKE?" Is it, as asserted by ROBERT HALL, that "every requisite which we can conceive necessary in a restorative dispensation is found in the gospel, exhibited with a perspicuity level to the meanest capacity; combined with such a depth in the contrivance, and such an exquisite adaptation to our state and condition, as surpass finite comprehension."‡

Or is it that, "on the right reception of which, (the gospel,) or its rejection, turns our everlasting weal or woe"? §

Or is it that, "subsequently to that period, (the resurrection,) we admit, without hesitation, that the converts to the christian faith submitted to that ordinance, (baptism,) prior to their reception in the christian church"? ‖

Or that, "in insisting upon the prior claim which baptism possesses to the attention of a christian convert, the advocates of strict communion triumph without an opponent"? ¶

Or that, "in ancient times, the necessity of baptism as a qualification for communion was avowedly and uniformly founded on its supposed essential connexion with salvation"? **

Or that, "we certainly make no scruple of informing a pedobaptist candidate that we consider him as unbaptized, and disdain all concealment upon the subject"? ††

Or is it, as asserted by my LEARNED FRIEND, that christening "becomes a cover for delusion;" or that, "there has been in the Protestant church much of superstition, in holding baptismal regeneration"?

Or that, "the subjects of baptism, in the New Testament, were not ordinarily of the same age as the subjects of baptism where christianity is nationally received"? Or that, "confession goes before, leading to salvation; but baptism follows, sealing our confession"? Or, as by the Fourth Witness, that "immersion is doubtless baptism"?

Or as it is implied by the Sixth, that "the verbs Βαπτω and Βαπτιζω signify to dip, or immerse"?

* 1 Kings xv. 5. † See 2 Sam. xxii. 22—24.
‡ His Works, vol. i., pages 349, 350. § Ib. 209. ‖ Vol. ii. 55.
¶ Vol. ii. 66. ** Ib. 376. †† Ib. 322.

Or as it is asserted by the Seventh, that "the meaning of Βαπτιζω is, I plunge, or sink completely under water: I oppress, or overwhelm, by bringing burdens or afflictions"?

Or as, by the Eighth, that "the two texts, Rom. vi. 4, and Col. ii. 12, favour the mode of dipping"?

Or is it to quail and lament that he and his constituents are stigmatized as unbaptized persons, and, by so quailing and lamenting, to indicate the feeling that they are justly stigmatized?

Or as is mentioned by the Tenth, that "a person may have all that is essential to baptism by being dipped"?

It would be a false charity, gentlemen, to suppose there is any "involuntary mistake" in all this; rather may we conclude that, in defiance of all the persuasions, exhortations, and denunciations contained in the Will to the contrary, the Plaintiffs are, as their prototypes the Jews of old were, wilfully ignorant, and fully determined to do as did their fathers before them.* How they had the courage to bring their case into court, it is not for us to explain. But since they have submitted their claim to be tried by the standard of truth, it is our duty to point out to you where it falls short, and yours to "judge righteous judgment."†

You have already heard sufficient to convince you, gentlemen, how immeasurably their cause does fall short; nevertheless, as I have allowed the Witnesses to proceed with little interruption, I shall call them up again, and in the same rotation as previously, in order to extort more from them, and furnish you with additional instances where each of them is at variance with himself, as they have themselves already shown how much they are at variance with each other. The witness box, gentlemen, is a confessional, where, under a close examination, few can withhold the secrets of their hearts. I therefore beg your serious attention to their further disclosures, on which, as they proceed, I shall remark.

The First Witness said, "The sum of the apostle's meaning of 'What shall they do that are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?'‡ appears to be this: If there be no resurrection of the dead, those who on becoming christians expose themselves to all manner of privations, crosses, severe sufferings, and a violent death, can have no compensation, nor any motives sufficient to induce them to expose themselves to such miseries. But as they receive baptism as an emblem of *death*, in voluntarily going under the water, so they

* See Acts vii. 51—53. † John vii. 24. ‡ 1 Cor. xv. 29.

receive it as an emblem of the *resurrection* unto eternal *life*, in coming up out of the water; thus they are *baptized for the dead* in perfect faith of the resurrection."

Here, gentlemen, we have no "possibilities," no "probabilities," no evasions, no "involuntary mistake," as to what the word baptize means; but direct evidence, and from a determined opponent even, that baptism *is* a *voluntary* going down under, and coming up out of, the water.

"It is worthy of remark, that ... God appears to have made very little use of human *eloquence*, even when possessed by pious men. His own nervous truths, announced by plain common sense, though in homely phrase, have been the general means of the conviction and conversion of sinners. Human *eloquence* and *learning* have often been successfully employed in defending the *outworks* of christianity; but *simplicity* and *truth* have preserved the *citadel*."*

This, gentlemen, is encouragement for us, and accords with what I have before sought to impress upon your minds, *i. e.*, that you must be on your guard, lest you should be biassed by men of learning, and by great names. This Witness, I believe, is generally acknowledged to be a profound classical scholar; and you have his authority that it is *simplicity* and *truth*, and not what is taught at universities and academies, that preserves the doctrines of Christ from the corruption of man.

"In vain are all pretensions among sects and parties to the privileges of the church of Christ, if they have not the *doctrine* and the *life* of Christ. *Traditions* and *legends* are not *apostolic doctrines;* and *showy ceremonies* are not *the life of God* in the soul of man. *Religion* has no need of human ornaments or trappings; it shines by its own light, and is refulgent with its own glory. When it is not in life and power, men have endeavoured to produce a *specious image*, dressed and ornamented with their own hands. Into this God never breathed; therefore it can do no good to man, and only imposes on the ignorant and credulous, by a vain show of lifeless pomp and splendour. This phantom, called *true religion*, and the *church*, by its votaries, is in heaven denominated *vain superstition* — the speechless symbol of departed piety."†

And this is the declaration of one nearly connected with the Establishment. Therefore "consider this, ye that forget God;"‡ ye who teach "for doctrines the commandments of men;"§ and ye who,

* 1 Cor. i. 17. † End of 2nd chapter of Ephesians. ‡ Ps. l. 22.
§ Mark vii. 7.

by grand organs, choice pictures, painted windows, rich communion decorations, and commandments (little attended to,) written in letters of gold, make a display in your cathedrals, churches, and chapels; ye who ornament your persons with mitres, aprons, bands, surplices, cassocks, and gowns, and that wrangle among yourselves whether ye shall preach in a black gown or in a white one; ye who think the bread and the wine undergo a change while being consecrated — that think a dying man may be saved by the actual or imaginary eating or drinking of them; ye who pretend to be of apostolic descent, and therefore take upon you to absolve from sin; ye that attend a christening in all your decorations, and make it a day of pomp, splendour, and feasting — that bring for the occasion water from Jordan — that use massy candlesticks and tall candles at noon-day; ye that must omit saying "Holy Father" on "Trinity Sunday"; consider these things; which, according to the First Witness, are only *vain superstitions*, the *speechless symbols of departed piety.*

And, gentlemen, my learned friend supports his Witness in language something similar. "Secularity," he says, "or love of the world, is the grand temptation of the church at this time. It enters into religion, and religion becomes sensuous; and we glory in music, and architecture, and dress, and outside show, and form, instead of the life, the spirit, and the power of godliness."*

The Second Witness said, "Some say Christ did neither baptize infants, nor command his disciples so to do. That is not to be wondered at, if we consider that they had already entered into covenant with God by circumcision, and christian baptism was not instituted. John's baptism was baptism of repentance, of which infants are incapable."†

If, gentlemen, John's baptism was not christian baptism, what description of baptism was it? It was from heaven;‡ and was instituted at "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ."§ "The law and the prophets were until John; since that time, the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it."‖ The Testator, in order "to fulfil all righteousness," was baptized of John: and he himself is said to have baptized others.¶ Thus did he set his people an example: and there is no other way of fulfilling all righteousness, but by believing in him, being baptized in the faith

* The Promised Glory of the Church of Christ, by the Rev. E. Bickersteth, pages 250, 251.

† Page 68. ‡ Mark xi. 30. § Mark i. 1. ‖ Luke xvi. 16. ¶ John iii. 22.

of the promise, and observing all other things which he has commanded. The baptism of repentance is the only literal baptism; though, after the Testator's ascension, converts were baptized with the Spirit, after being baptized with water, which they were not immediately after being baptized by John. Witness what Peter said on the day of Pentecost, the day when the commission was first acted upon: "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you," &c. These words could not have been addressed to those who had been baptized by John, or by our Lord's disciples, because they had already been baptized, and had received the Holy Ghost.* And, according to this Witness' own showing, no infants could have been baptized on that day; while since that day there has been no other baptism instituted. It was a lame subterfuge, then, to say that Christ did not command infants to be baptized, because they had already entered into covenant with him by circumcision. Why, the Testator himself was baptized, thirty years after he had been circumcised; and there was not a man baptized previous to the day of Pentecost, who had not entered into the same covenant in the same manner. And the Witness himself must allow, that both the Testator and Peter ordered such to be baptized.

"All those who would be accepted with God unto righteousness and life, must be such as do believe in Christ with the heart, and openly confess with the mouth that he is the Son of God, and the Saviour of the world."†

Behold, gentlemen, the sum and substance of all we are defending again conceded to us!

"Sacraments must be of divine institution; not of human invention. The church can make no sacraments; her duty is, with care and caution to *administer* them. ... The elements are cyphers. It is the institution makes the figures. Divine institution is as necessary to a sacrament as the royal inscription is to current money.‡ ... And yet men are most forward to that service of God which is of man's finding out, and setting up. Man likes better to worship a god of his own making, than to worship the God that made him; and likes any way of worshipping God which is of his own framing, more than that which is of God's appointing."§

This is the evidence of a thorough churchman; evidence, gentlemen, the latter part of which is fully borne out by "The Book of Common Prayer, to be used in the Churches of England," to every

* See Acts ii. 1—4. † Page 518. ‡ Page 482. § Page 733.

line of which this Witness has subscribed. By a statute of parliament, in the reign of Edward VI., this prayer book was "MADE PERFECT;" and it was then determined, decreed, and proclaimed, that thenceforth all the ministers of the said church should believe and practise *such things only* as the said book teaches.

Thus, gentlemen, while earthly knowledge is rapidly advancing, the knowledge of the scriptures, as taught by the Church of England, remains stationary, whilst its discipline is rapidly retrograding. According to its canons and rubrics, not a member of it can either advance or recede a single step. How men, enlightened in most things, save that of their eternal welfare, can still submit to such bondage, it is difficult to explain. Doubtless they are governed by habit; which, says the adage, "is second nature," and is proved to be stronger than the first, and more difficult to be overcome. Not one of a thousand examines or thinks for himself; and he that does has rarely the courage to act up to his convictions. Look, gentlemen, at the twenty-seventh chapter of Exodus. There you will see, that everything relating to the worship of God must be of God's own instituting: none, therefore, can approach him acceptably, but by the way of his own ordinances, as commanded in the gospel. As Moses did, we must attend to the "PATTERN."

Gentlemen, you have noticed that the evidence of this Witness, who is one of the parties who "hired" my learned friend to "accuse" us before the Court, is directly at variance with his own counsel. His counsel asserts, that "the church has scriptural authority to decree rites and ceremonies," while the "hirer" of this counsel asserts, that "the church has no such authority, that it can make no sacrament;" that "divine institution is as necessary to a sacrament, as the royal inscription is to current money."

"The light under which men sin, puts extraordinary aggravations upon their sins; answerable whereunto will be the degrees of their punishment. The gentiles will be condemned for disobeying the light of nature, the law of God written on their hearts; but much greater wrath is reserved for the Jews, unto whom were committed the oracles of God; but the greatest of all is reserved for Christians, who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ; these shall be punished with "everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe."*

* 2 Thes. i. 9, 10. (Page 474.)

Here, then, is a truth which the disobedient will do well to ponder: more especially as it comes from one of their own body, who, according to his evidence when under cross-examination, cannot be suspected of "an involuntary mistake;" yet he commits the egregious error of giving the appellation of Christians to those who do not obey the gospel.*

The Third Witness said, "The ceremony of immerging the body of the baptized in water, represents the burial of a dead person under ground. The pouring of water upon the party, in cases where the former cannot conveniently be done, answers to covering and throwing earth upon a person so dead. But both agree in figuring a death and burial; as the emerging again figureth a new life."†

That the pouring of water on an infant answers to throwing earth upon a coffin after it is lowered into the grave, is a new idea; and as incongruous as it is new; the throwing of the earth, and the pouring of water, are both the institutions of man. The figure is cleverly and cunningly worded, and might pass current with a cursory hearer; but the pouring of water can hardly be construed into a representation at all; and, taken in its best phase, it can represent only half the intended figure, and that not the most cheering half; while it leaves unrepresented the half which is the christian's glory, joy, and comfort—the resurrection of his Lord. Here he is at variance with all the other Witnesses, who say that the pouring of water answers to the pouring down of the Spirit. But, gentlemen, I will not waste your time on this vain subject. It is enough for our cause, that immerging and emerging are, even by our opponents, allowed to be the only figures alluded to in the text, and cannot be "an involuntary mistake."

The Fourth Witness said, "It is highly reasonable to believe the Bible to be a divine revelation....The things that are absolutely necessary to salvation are few, simple, and obvious to the meanest capacity, provided it be attended by an humble, teachable disposition. ...He that believeth hath the witness in himself....The consequences of our present conduct, according to the scriptures, are so immense, that if there were only a bare possibility that they were divine truth, it would be madness to run the risk of rejecting them for the sake of gaining the whole world; what then shall we think of those, who, having unanswerable demonstrations of their being the word of God, that they cannot reasonably doubt of it for a moment, yet

* Acts xi. 26. † See His Bible, Rom. vi. 4.

disobey the commands, and neglect the salvation revealed in them, for the veriest trifle which can be proposed."*

Gentlemen, does not he himself profess to have these unanswerable demonstrations? aye, and also to believe that they are such? Does not he himself disobey the commands contained in the word, and neglect the salvation that is therein revealed? Yes! and that for the veriest trifle; the shame or the pecuniary loss of leaving, or the honour of belonging to, the Church of England, that church respecting which he has not scrupled to assert that "unadulterated christianity is not what even our creeds and articles represent it," which consequently are opposed to "divine truth."

"I cannot," said he, "but feel and consider myself as a man that has been peculiarly prospered of God, and I desire to acknowledge this with humble and devout gratitude....Whatever my *feelings* may at any time be, my situation and infirmities, and perhaps also my turn of mind, expose me at times to considerable gloom and depression; I have not all that enjoyment which I could earnestly desire....YET THIS IS MY DELIBERATE JUDGMENT,—yea, and on the whole I can add, with good confidence,—not only that goodness and mercy HAVE followed, but that they shall follow me, all the days of my life, and that I shall dwell in the house of the Lord for ever.† ...My feelings are often very uneasy, but I am free from great and sharp sufferings.‡... I am apt to be impatient, unbelieving, and cowardly....Perhaps, when warmed with the subject, I speak more strongly of my own personal confidence than my habitual *feelings* warrant, but my dejected feelings are often perfectly unaccountable, and the least matter makes me subject to them. But I trust all will end well.§ I know not how it is I repent and believe; I think, I am *sure* I do, but I do not obtain the *clear* sense of pardon. There seems *a great gulph fixed* which I cannot pass.‖...I hope, I fear, I tremble, I pray....In the midst of the conflict I generally express hope of final victory, but think I shall die under a cloud.¶ ...I have not *triumphant* assurance, but something which is more calm and satisfactory.**...Hope...generally predominates; though... even one fear, *where infinity is at stake*, is sufficient to countervail all its consoling effects.††...In every thing but comfort, my state is even *sublimely christian*,...and is bright in every one's views but my

* Preface to Bible. † His Life, pages 473. ‡ Ibid., page 476.
§ Ibid., page 494. ‖ Ibid., page 562. ¶ Ibid., pages 550—551.
** Ibid., page 552. †† Ibid., page 545.

own. To my own apprehension, I in a great measure *walk in darkness*,...with scarcely...a gleam of joy.*... One scene of my life presented me as an individual walking rather in the twilight of enjoyment, where the sun and the shade were struggling together for victory, than in a region of unmixed happiness. But are not such thoughts and anxieties the natural accompaniments of every step of our pilgrimage? and if finally dispersed by the light of faith, and hope, and christian joy, does not their presence supply even a stronger evidence to the bystander of the safety of the individual, than their absence? Undisturbed serenity may be undisturbed delusion; a calm after anxiety is a victory after the battle, is the palm when the battle is won.†...Under all the circumstances of the case, to have expected that my mind should be kept uniformly cheerful, and filled with bright anticipations, would not only have been to expect little less than a miracle, but would have shown a defective acquaintance with the operations of the human mind, and with God's dealings with his established and matured servants....Deep thinkers and highly gifted persons are seldom favoured with such joy and peace in believing as are experienced by common minds. Men must always pay the penalty annexed to pre-eminence above their fellows."‡

Gentlemen, we have here an awful instance of the "wrath of man" praising the Lord. Inasmuch as this Witness is made to testify to the truth of what is written by Isaiah and Paul, "The way-faring men, though fools, shall not err therein;" while "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty; and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, yea and things which are not, to bring to nought things which are; that no flesh should glory in his presence."§

We have also in the evidence of this Witness the painful winding up of the life of one "baptized as a christian, and taught to believe the doctrines, and practise the duties of christianity, as prescribed by the Rubrics of the Church of England." He has given us ample proof that he has NOT the "the witness in himself."‖ And that he was *much* more *troubled* about the doctrine of baptism, and

* His Life, page 529. † Ibid., page 547, 548. ‡ Ibid., page 543.
§ Isa. xxxv. 8; 1 Cor. i. 26—29. ‖ 1 John v. 10.

remaining where he was, than he was willing in the early part of his evidence to allow. How he can enjoy anything more satisfactory than *triumphant assurance*, I leave those that brought him here to explain; and they may also explain how he who continues to *walk in darkness*, can expect any other than to *die under a cloud*. What he says of the disturbed state of his mind, may be taken as an epitome of the state of mind of those professors of christianity who are so only to outward appearance—such as are sometimes denominated by the religious world "*pious*," and sometimes "*doubting believers*," (an expression, above every other expression, the most incongruous.) Doubts and fears are the accompaniments of every step of their pilgrimage; and how the constant presence of two such enemies should be a greater proof of safety than their absence, is to common minds unintelligible, seeing the assertion is so much at variance with scripture.* Should there be any persons in the court who feel the same compunctions which this Witness once felt, at remaining in communion with a people who he was convinced did not worship God in truth, we beseech them to take warning by the example of his sufferings; to come out from among them, and, "ere the night cometh," be separate, that the Lord may receive them;† and to keep before their eyes the following text, "Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee, because he trusteth in thee."‡

It is a fatal "mistake, gentlemen, which prevails among men, that it is sufficient for their eternal happiness if they feel some serious emotions at the latter end of their days; while it is a maxim confirmed by universal experience, that every man dies as he lives. It is by the general tenor of his life, and not by a particular frame of mind at the *hour* of death, that he will be judged." According to the scriptures, none can expect to enjoy the peace of God in truth, but those who have confessed with their mouth,§ in the way ordained in the gospel, "that Jesus Christ is the Son of God."‖

In the last hours of an unbeliever's life, the mind may be affected by disease, which disease may assume a joyous tone; or the mere absence of bodily pain may cause such pleasurable sensations, that although there may be no hope, the individual may appear placid, contented, happy, resigned, and joyful; yet these are no criteria by which to judge of his real state. But when an individual, through

* See Rev. xxi. 8. † 2 Cor. vi. 17; see also Isa. lii. 11. ‡ Isa. xxvi. 3.
§ Rom. x. 9. ‖ See Acts viii. 37.

the whole course, or through the latter years, of his life, never attains to a clear sense of pardon, but on the contrary walks in darkness, with fear and trembling, it is a certain sign that his heart is not right with God.*

Again, gentlemen, believers are subject to disease, like other men. "We," says Dr. Cheyne, "have known many instances of insanity among believers, but it was not caused by their creed....We firmly believe that the gospel, received simply, never, since it was first preached, produced a single case of insanity; the admission that it has such a tendency ought never to have been made to the enemies of the cross. We have granted that fanaticism and superstition have caused insanity, as well they may; nay, derangement of the mind may have often been caused by the terrors of the law; but, by the gospel, by a knowledge of, and trust in Jesus, NEVER....We have also known instances in which all sense of religion has been permanently destroyed by insanity. Of such cases we would remark, that the believer has no right to expect for his believing friend exemption from evils arising from the state of the body, on which insanity always depends. Let him moreover recollect, that as total insanity puts an end to moral accountability, nothing which may take place during a paroxysm can affect the future happiness of his friend."†

No man, gentlemen, can be in a state of salvation, and himself be ignorant of it. The thing is impossible. Every man knows himself to be a sinner, until the Spirit of God has convinced him that he is a saint.‡ No spiritual blessing ever comes to any soul but by "the word of God;" this is "the sword of the Spirit;" and God never makes use of any other instrument in his work upon the heart. This, every believer knows; for it is impossible for man to receive anything of an heavenly nature, but what he receives in his understanding by the influence of the Spirit acting on his own mind; therefore he must be as sensible from whence he received it, and that he has received it, as he is sensible whence he receives, and that he does receive, his natural food. And when he is truly "risen with Christ, through the faith of the operation of God,"§ he can say, without doubt, fear, or the shadow of wavering, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that

* See what is said of the fearful, Rev. xxi. 8.

† Dr. Cheyne on Derangement of the Mind. ‡ See 1 John v. 9—12.

§ Col. ii. 12.

which I have committed unto him against that day."* "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death."†

Gentlemen, no truth can be greater than this, "Where infinity is at stake, ONE fear is sufficient to countervail all the consoling effects of hope." "Because fear hath torment; he that feareth is not made perfect in love."‡ What are we to understand by "being sublimely christian" in everything but comfort? and what is comfort, gentlemen? Is it not the fruit of hope? and is it not the christian's *sheet*-anchor, which, when embedded in the sure ground of the gospel, sets at defiance all the storms and billows of Satan?§

That this Witness is altogether ignorant of the uniform confidence of the believer, is, by the way he expresses himself, manifest. For the believer's joyful anticipation of coming into possession of his heavenly inheritance, is as positive as that of the unbeliever's coming into possession of an earthly one. Where the claims are just, the one is as certain as the other.‖ Nay, much more so, for the latter might lose his through death; while the former, immediately after death, enters upon it. Nevertheless, believers are men, and their outward spirits may be depressed, like those of other men, by earthly disappointments, by losses, by pain, or sickness. Yet, unlike other men, their inward man remains undisturbed amidst all these things, and they can individually say with Paul, "I am filled with comfort, I am exceeding joyful in all our tribulation."¶

I shall here point out the state of Paul's mind, (which is, in degree, that of every believer's,) in order to contrast it with that of this Witness, who has been taught by the Rubrics. Paul, who was taught of God, and who shows to us "the way of salvation," in writing to the Corinthians, says, "Blessed be God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies, and the God of all comfort, who comforteth us in all our tribulation, that we may be able to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God."** And again, writing to Timothy, he says, "I am now ready to be offered...I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which

* 2 Tim. i. 12. † Rom. viii. 2.
‡ 1 John iv. 18. § See Titus i. 2, and ii. 13; Heb. vi. 19.
‖ See Col. i. 12; iii. 24; Heb. ix. 15; 1 Peter i. 3, 4. ¶ 2 Cor. vii. 4.
** 2 Cor. i. 3, 4.

the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them that love his appearing."* And yet Paul was a "deep thinker, and a highly gifted person;" but not "after the flesh."

Allow me, gentlemen, to remark here, that there is both a good and an evil attending such a declaration as this Witness has made. A good, when it serves as a beacon to warn others from such a perilous close of what is denominated a religious life; and an evil, when it serves as a decoy, to make others imagine they may be safe while following in the wake of such a well-known character. An instance of the latter I will give you, without mentioning names; it is from a recent publication. "Many and perplexing were his mental exercises, and deep and humiliating was his contrition for sin. Often ... did he speak of himself in the character of a backslider, deploring that he had done so little for Christ, and that days of health and prosperity had been suffered to pass without any suitable improvement. So full and impressive was his perception of unworthiness, that he found it difficult to realize his interest in the love of God. ... The closing portions of the life of the late Rev. Thomas Scott afforded him great consolations, during the last few days of his continuance here. When his mother read those parts of the narrative which indicated some degree of doubt and perplexity in the mind of that eminent servant of Christ, he remarked, 'Well, if so good and holy a man found it difficult at times to realize an assured hope, a poor creature like me need not feel surprised that all should not be bright sunshine.' When he was pointed to the glorious work of the all-sufficient Redeemer, he would say, 'Yes, I know it well; but how difficult it is to feel one's own interest in it.' He seemed ever ready to question his own repentance and faith—not the power and grace of the Saviour. On the day before he died, his father said to him, 'Are you happy, dear Joseph?' He replied, peacefully, 'Yes, more so than I have been.' It was then asked, 'Can you repose your interests for eternity upon Christ?' He said, 'I think I can; but I am a poor unworthy sinner, and I find it hard work to believe that I am really a partaker of salvation.' He was reminded that he must look to Christ, just as a sinner. 'Ah!' said he, 'that is a great mercy; I am striving to do so.'"

The Court has now before it two conspicuous beacons, to indicate how it may avoid some of the shoals and quicksands that lie in the

* 2 Tim. iv. 6—8.

narrow channel of salvation. And if there be any individual in it who is in the habit of making similar declarations, or of saying, Mr. or Mrs. So-and-so confesses to have doubts, and "I am sure he or she will be saved;" let him beware, lest he also should at the end of his passage through life be wrecked on one of them; and let him pray to be enabled to follow the advice of Solomon,* to "avoid it, pass not by it, turn from it, and pass away." Let him also take warning by what is further said of the same individual, in this same publication: "Truth requires that we should state, for the good of other young christians," (professedly such,) "that, in the near prospect of eternity, he was deeply humbled in the review of his religious profession, and that he spoke with regret of himself and others, that they had not advanced in their spiritual course as might have been expected, considering both their professions and their advantages. With many tears he deplored that their want of devotion to Christ had been a stumbling-block to others, who had made no profession of the christian faith. As he solemnly entreated that this might not be concealed, it is thus publicly announced, that others who profess to be christians may live very near to God, and may guard against those backslidings of the heart which grieved and distressed him on the brink of the dark valley." These, gentlemen, are the declarations of one of our opponents, who died at the age of 24, and were written by another of them. An instance of *apparent* good, I have witnessed, in a minister, who informed me that, in consequence of reading the declarations of the Fourth Witness, he had relinquished his ministry, because he could no longer conscientiously retain it; but, after hearkening to the voice of other charmers, he resumed it.

The Fifth Witness said, "The gospel contains whatever it *expresses*, and whatever it IMPLIES, but it contains nothing more. Nothing more then can be lawfully inculcated by the preacher as a part of the gospel. In examining the express declarations of scripture, he is bound to give them that sense which the words obviously convey, the current of the context demands, and the circumstances in which they were uttered point out. Beyond this he cannot go, without *adding to the words of God*, and exposing himself to *be reproved by him, and found a liar*. This sense he cannot change at all, for one which he conceives will better suit and support any part of the whole of a preconceived system, a doctrine of his own philosophy,

* Prov. iv. 15.

or a tenet of the church, sect, or party to which he belongs.*...Thus saith the Lord, is to every christian a pole-star, an infallible guide over the ocean of doubt.†...

"On the belief of the gospel, then, Christ has made the salvation of the whole human race absolutely to depend; that is, so far as it should be published to them.‡...To be baptized in the name of Christ, is, as every one who reads the gospel knows, a public and most solemn profession of faith in him as the Redeemer of mankind.§ ...Evangelical faith and repentance are indispensable to the existence of any moral good in the soul of man, and are in all instances the beginning of that good,‖... for no man ever obeys in a scriptural sense until after he has believed.¶...

"It is evident that *that* which on the part of mankind makes them Christ's children, is their own voluntary gift of themselves to him. Accordingly, St. Paul, in 2 Cor. viii. 5, speaking to the Corinthians, or Macedonian christians, says, 'that they first gave their ownselves to the Lord.'...Confidence, then, in his character, and in his promise as founded on it, is that act of the mind by which alone it renders itself to Christ, and becomes his, one of his children, his disciple, his follower. Unless the soul confide in him, it is plainly impossible that it should confide, or yield itself to him, and unless it yield itself to him, it cannot become his.**...

"The rules given by God, alone render baptism lawful in any case; no qualifications in any person render him a proper candidate for baptism, in any other sense than as they place him within those rules. Without these rules, regeneration would not render his baptism lawful. With them we are to accord in every case, and are to ask no questions concerning anything except what they require.††...

"My views of my own attainments as a christian are unaffectedly humble. On this subject I am reluctant to converse, conceiving... that mere professions are of little value; rarely, if ever, have I been known to mention it. I never speak of myself as a christian—my humility in this respect is striking;...when speaking of the christians present, I never include myself among them. My declarations on this subject, in health and in sickness, always are, that I do not *know* that I have any personal interest in the mediation of Christ.... I am usually free from distressing doubts and apprehensions, and my hopes are often bright and supporting."‡‡

* Vol. 2, page 486. † Ibid., page 447. ‡ Vol. 1, page 391.
§ Vol. ii. page 349. ‖ Ibid., Page 355. ¶ Vol. i., page 526.
** Vol. i., page 526, 527. †† Vol. ii., page 525. ‡‡ His Life, page 51.

Gentlemen, Is this the evidence of a man labouring under an "involuntary mistake"? No! it is another instance of the wrath of man praising the Lord—another pre-eminent character deploring his lost state, acknowledging his ignorance of having an interest in Christ. A melancholy evidence, as I have before shown, that he has not that interest. The truly humble glory and rejoice that it has pleased God to call them by his grace.* But is the humility this Witness ascribes to himself genuine humility? Is it not the admission of a consciousness that he is not a christian,† and does he not act wisely in not adding hypocrisy to sin? Faith and Hope, gentlemen, never take up their abode with Doubt and Apprehension; they are at such irreconcilable enmity with each other, that they can never by any possibility inhabit the same mansion.‡

This Witness asseverates, and asseverates truly, that no rules but those given by God can in any case render baptism lawful. Well then, gentlemen, as neither he nor any other of the Witnesses have brought forward any rules or precedents from the gospel, or any direction or commandment of the Lord, for christening infants, it is manifest that the Plaintiffs do not take their rules from the gospel; and it is equally manifest that they cannot claim under the Will. Indeed, their general leaning is to other authority. Even this Witness has informed you, that although he has been thirty-four years a preacher of what he denominates the gospel, his only satisfactory hope is, that he has taught and practised that which is found in almost every Protestant creed. But you know, gentlemen, that every Protestant creed is framed by man, and is the doctrine of man; as such, it is displeasing to God.§ The First and Second Witnesses give Dr. Lightfoot for their authority; the third, the "Prayer Book;" the Fourth repudiates the Prayer Book, but acts according to its Rubrics; the Sixth gives his brethren of the same persuasion, their churches, and congregations; the Seventh, the book of Genesis; the Eighth, apostolic tradition, backed by the light of nature, and the acts of the heathen Greeks and Romans; the Ninth, early antiquity; and the Tenth, his ordination vows, and the thousands which practise the same rite.

Now mark, gentlemen, the self-contradiction of this Fifth Witness. He christens the infant, but tells the man, that to be baptized in the name of Christ is to make a public profession of him as the Redeemer. Thus, on the one hand, he requires his hearers to give

* Rom. v. 2. † See Col. ii. 23. ‡ See Amos iii. 3. § Matt. xv. 9.

their infants to the Lord; and, on the other, informs them that that act is of no avail, seeing it is the voluntary gift of the individuals themselves that makes them children of God. He tells you, "'Thus saith the Lord,' is the pole star of every christian;" which binds them to give the words the meaning which they obviously carry, and which the context demands. Well, gentlemen, "Thus saith the Lord, ... Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image; ...Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them." And what is false worship? Is it not, as I have before asked, the antitype to the worship of a graven image? And yet this Witness, contrary to his own avowal, often wrests the passages which make against his adopted creed. We have here had a specimen of the teaching of this highly popular character: and in him we have also a specimen of what is passing around us. Let an individual once gain the name of a popular preacher, and immediately the world becomes so enamoured with him, as to receive from his mouth, as sound doctrine, the most heterogeneous jumble of truth and error.

His observation, "that no man ever obeys in a scriptural sense, until after he has believed," is in accordance with the Will, and with the passage he quotes.* For no one can be a disciple of Christ, nor bring glory to his name, until he has, in the ordinance of baptism, boldly confessed him,† as 'his Lord, and his God.'‡ Because genuine baptism is the first act by which he can make it manifest to whom his life is devoted;§ after which, he proves his devotedness by "ministering to the saints," and observing all other things which the Lord has commanded; looking forward with certainty to be set with the sheep on the right hand of the king, and to hear him say, "Come, ye blessed of my Father; inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in: naked, and ye clothed me: I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me."‖

The Sixth Witness said, "The profit to the child must be through the medium of the parent; and it has long appeared to me, that it is to the parent, rather than to the child, that infant baptism is in the first instance to be reckoned a privilege."¶

* 2 Cor. viii. 5. † John viii. 31; 1 John iv. 2, 3.
‡ John xx. 28: Matt. x. 32, 33; Luke vii. 30.
§ See Acts xix. 4—6; John xii. 42, 43; and xiv. 23.
‖ Matt. xxv. 33—36. ¶ Page 189.

You will observe, gentlemen, that he makes the child a nonentity in the business; a satisfactory proof of the uselessness of the rite. But whence does he derive his doctrine? Not from his favourite precedent, the "Abrahamic covenant," because, in that covenant, circumcision was the privilege of the child, the token which at once brought him within it .And if the parents neglected the rite, it was at the expense of the child, not of that of the parent.*

"It has been alleged,...in regard to infant baptism, *the New Testament is silent*, and *this silence alone is sufficient to set it aside.*† ...We deny the proof of the affirmation,‡... the burden of proof lies on the side of our opponents. They seek a precept in positive terms: Let the infant children of proselytes to the faith of the gospel be baptized with their parents. But we demand a precept in similar positive terms; Let the children of proselytes be no longer admitted, as formerly, to the sign and seal of the blessings of the covenant of God. We call for the production of an express declaration that such admission is inconsistent with the spirituality of the new dispensation."§

Why, gentlemen, this Witness appears to forget that we are the Defendants, and that it is for the Plaintiffs to disprove our claim, and to establish that of their infants. For as far as regards themselves, it can scarcely be said that they make any. And you have heard enough to convince you that they can neither disprove the one, nor establish the other. The Witnesses are agreed that if the children live long enough after they have been christened, to commit sin, that their christening is a dead letter. But if they die previously to committing it, they are not agreed as to whether the christened child has any advantage over the unchristened one. They look to us,—rather an unusual thing in British jurisprudence,—to help out their cause, by challenging us to produce an express prohibition against christening infants. Why, gentlemen, has he not himself produced it? Has he not declared, as I have before shown, "that we have a new constitution introduced, which involves the abrogation of what had been, and settles what is now to be?" The silence of the gospel respecting infant sprinkling, is sufficient of itself to show that it is not a plant of the Lord's planting, and therefore, according to his word, it "shall be rooted up."‖

"We have no recorded instance of the baptism of any person

* Gen. xvii. 14. † Page 99. ‡ Page 100. § Page 115.
‖ Matt. xv. 13.

grown to manhood, that had been born of Jewish converts, or of Gentile proselytes to the faith of Christ; nor have we in any of the apostolic epistles to the churches, the remotest allusion, in the form of direction or of warning, to the reception of such children by baptism into the Christian Church, upon their professing the faith in which they have been brought up.*... Our Baptist brethren present us, in support of their system, with instances of the baptism of *adults*. They would do something more to their purpose if they could produce one or two examples of the baptism of *such adults* as those mentioned. These would be in point. But nothing of the kind is to be found; nothing in the form either of fact, or allusion, or advice, or precept."†

Here, gentlemen, is another instance of the futile subterfuges of our opponents. What says the Testator? "Go ye, and *teach* all nations, baptizing them!" Baptizing whom? Those, unquestionably, whether born of saints or of sinners, who had been taught. This command determines, once and for ever, the characters of those who come within the commission. And what further record is wanting?

This Witness, gentlemen, like many of the others, appears to see no line of demarcation between one sect and another. He accordingly acknowledges as brethren, not only the people of the south, though "*he cannot but think them very much in the wrong*," but even us also. But we disclaim his relationship, being his antipodes in faith and doctrine. If the Will furnish no standard by which to measure the doctrine of those whose fellowship we are commanded to quit, it is a useless thing, and Paul's advice to the Corinthians‡ is to us of no avail.

"Nothing can be easier, on such a subject, (the validity of infant baptism,) especially now, when we have so much criticism about it, made up by others, and ready to our hand, than even for the veriest sciolist to make a mighty parade of learning. On no subject, it is granted, and especially on no subject that involves the obligations of conscience towards God, are we to allow ourselves to be determined by the weight of human authority. 'He that judgeth us is the Lord.' And 'What saith the Lord?' ought to be our sole enquiry."§

Here you are again exhorted, gentlemen, and by another opponent, not to let your judgments be warped by the weight of names. How disinterested and friendly is his conduct towards us! For I am not

* Page 134. † Page 136. ‡ 2 Cor. vi. 14—18. § Preface, page 16.

aware that any whom the world calls *weighty*, are the advocates of our cause. "Not many wise,"* &c. If "What saith the Lord?" had been the Plaintiff's sole enquiry, you, gentlemen, would have been spared the trouble of hearing his evidence.

The Seventh Witness said, "My dear and respected anti-pedobaptist brethren, (for I trust you will still permit me so to call you,) I have used great freedom with your distinguishing sentiments. 'Wherefore? because I love you not? God knoweth.'† I certainly think your baptism to be the human improvement of a superstitious age, and to partake of all the monstrosity in its form, and all the cruelty of unwarrantable exclusion in its diminished administration, which might be expected from such an origin. When a society, or when individuals, are led to renounce the baptism of the Holy Scriptures, and to repeat the ordinance under a form of their own, when they refuse the pledge of God's special regard for the posterity of his people, and banish from their families an ordinance which expressly includes them, without any exception. I am sometimes told, that such persons, and such only, are baptized christians. This is language, my friends, to which I give place by subjection, no, not for an hour. Your principles, and your practice, and somewhat also of your manner of speaking with regard to the ordinance of baptism, are quite opposite, as you have already seen, to every view which I have been able to take of the meaning of the Holy Scriptures....

"I regard many of you as saints and faithful in Christ Jesus. Your anti-pedobaptism is to me a cause of no small regret. But for yourselves I entertain sincere affection and esteem, which I trust may last, till, in time, or in eternity, we shall be favoured of God with unlimited agreement."‡

Gentlemen, is it possible, may I be allowed to ask, that both parties can be saints? or, according to this Witness, can either of them be? One has no authority to christen infants; and that one denounces those who baptize believers, as administering an ordinance which is a monstrosity of superstition; yet, in despite of this monstrosity, he denominates them saints. Both he and the Eighth Witness, cling to, and even fawn upon us. And why? Is it not because they are aware their faith is based upon a quicksand, and that they feel, the more they build upon it, the deeper it sinks. Aye, and that they feel also that ours is based upon a Rock? a Rock which, though built upon for eternal ages, remains unmoveable.

* 1 Cor. i. 26. † 2 Cor. xi. 11. ‡ Pages 222, 223.

A saint, gentlemen, is a genuine follower of Christ; one who believes in him "to the saving of the soul;" one who confesses his belief in baptism; and who sees that even the baptism of the Spirit cannot supersede that ordinance which inducts him into the church of Christ, and entitles him to the name of christian.* Now if this description of character, which we avow, originates, as this Witness thinks it does, in superstition, how can he, with any consistency, regard us as brethren, as "saints and faithful in Christ Jesus"? If he chooses to claim kindred with us, we cannot hinder him; but we openly repudiate the relationship. No, no, gentlemen, the right understanding of the truth is of such vast consequence as to admit of no compromise. If he were at all conversant with the spirit of the Will, he would be convinced that if both parties leave this world as far estranged in opinion as they now are, they will never be favoured with unlimited agreement in the next. "If the tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be."†

The Eighth Witness said, "It enters into the nature of things ritual and circumstantial, to be mutable, transient, and liable to be changed. As they are often but an adoption of some national custom, (which is apparently the case as to the institution of baptism,) or an accommodation of a common usage to some purpose in religion, so they are alterable in their nature, and are themselves in some measure to be accommodated to the prevailing customs and tastes; to the several countries, climates, and tempers of mankind. ...Let us therefore, according to the apostolic precept, 'receive one another, but not to doubtful disputations.' To maintain a 'unity of spirit,' by mutual forbearance, and to live together in perfect charity, is a matter of infinitely more importance than the quantity of water, or the manner of its application."‡

Here, gentlemen, is a tacit acknowledgment that the rite of christening is but an adoption of some national custom. We consequently agree with this Witness, that the rite which the men of one country have adopted for their own accommodation, the men of another may, if they wish to run the same hazard, for the same reason, adopt in another form. But the New Testament ordinance originated with God; "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning,"§ and, like himself, it is immutable. And who shall

* See Acts ix. 17, 18; x. 47, 48; and xi. 16, 17.

† Eccl. xi. 3. See also Luke xvi. 26. ‡ Pages 129—131. § James i. 17.

dare to assert, without becoming obnoxious to the dreadful anathemas contained in Rev. xxii. 18, 19, that any of the commands of God may be accommodated to the prevailing customs, tastes, and tempers of mankind? As if the Will contained (as many of our opponents affirm it does contain,) essentials and non-essentials. If it did, how should we be able to distinguish one from another. We should have to "seek unto wizards, that peep and that mutter...from the the living to the dead;"* "or to one that is learned, ... and he saith, It is sealed;" or to him that is not learned, and he saith, "I am not learned."† But as it does not contain opposing principles, we are to seek to the instruction that the Almighty gave to the people of old, "Hearken, O Israel, unto the statutes, and unto the judgments which I teach you for to do them, that ye may live. ...Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."‡ That this Witness and his constituents have changed the ordinance of baptism he admits, by saying that "should immersion be allowed to have been the only ancient, apostolic, scriptural mode of baptizing, yet a strict adherence to it is not obligatory to us, but this circumstance may very lawfully and fitly be changed for that of sprinkling or pouring." This being a precept of man, I would recommend to his and their attention Isaiah xxix. 13, 14.

"Thou shalt rear up the tabernacle according to the fashion thereof which was shewed thee in the mount,"§ was the command given to Moses. Like unto it was the command given to Ezekiel; "Shew them the form of the house, and the fashion thereof, and the goings out thereof, and the comings in thereof, and all the forms thereof, and all the ordinances thereof; and all the forms thereof, and all the laws thereof: and write it in their sight, that they may keep the whole form thereof, and all the ordinances thereof, and do them."‖ "Teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you,"¶ was the command given by the Testator; who rebuked the Jews for rejecting the commandments of God, that they might keep their own traditions.** But, gentlemen, do not the Plaintiffs, to the very letter, do the same, and make "the word of God of none effect, through their traditions"?†† They plead the writings of Origen,

* Isaiah viii. 19. † Isa. xxix. 11, 12. ‡ Deut. iv. 1.
§ Exod. xxvi. 30. ‖ Ezek. xliii. 11. ¶ Matt. xxviii. 20.
** Mark vii. 9. †† Mark vii. 13.

of Cyprian, of Justin Martyr, and of Dr. Lightfoot. The latter says, "there is no place for this (baptism) among us, who are *born christians;* the condition therefore being varied, the rite is not only lawfully but deservedly varied also." The Testator, gentlemen, by his spirit, instructed the apostles how to rear the New Testament church; and showed them, in his person, the way of entrance into it.* This was the way by which Philip led the eunuch. "They went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him; and when they were come up out of the water, ... the eunuch went on his way rejoicing."† This baptism, gentlemen, will remain as invariable, throughout all ages, and in all climates, as the words of the Testator, who says, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."‡

But let us consider this apostolic precept, according as the Witness has quoted it; "*Receive ye one another*, but not to doubtful disputations."§ And to whom was this precept addressed? Not to those without, but to those who had been previously baptized. "To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints."‖ Neither is it now addressed to the unbaptized, as this Witness would make it appear. As we have opportunity, we are exhorted to do good unto all men, "especially unto them who are of the household of faith."¶ It is only among the latter that we are to endeavour "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace:"** with the former it is out of the question; and those of our opponents who are endeavouring to form among themselves what they call an "Evangelical Alliance" will eventually find, that, among their confusion of tongues, the endeavour will terminate as did the building of Babel. There is a grand difference, gentlemen, between the charity we are to exercise to all men, and the "fervent charity" which Paul exhorts believers to have among themselves. To call an unbeliever, one that has no title to the christian character, a brother; and thus to imply that he is in the way of salvation; so far from being an act of charity, it would be the most uncharitable act that we could do to him. "To treat all persons as alike safe, and all doctrines as alike good, would be a practice contradicting fact, involving a denial of God's word, and fraught with injustice, faithlessness, and ruin to our fellowmen."

* Matt. iii. 15. † Acts viii. 37—39. ‡ Matt. xxiv. 35.
§ Rom. xiv. i. ‖ Rom. i. 7. ¶ Gal. vi. 10. ** Eph. iv. 3.

Genuine gospel charity, gentlemen, is to point out to man the errors of his ways;* to endeavour to convince him of them, that he may turn to the Lord and live. It is not to say, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace."†

"He is our best friend," the Sixth Witness has said in another place, "who displaces error from our minds, and substitutes truth." I know no body of people that are more charitable and liberal than my clients are. They hold the free proclamation of the gospel; that Christ died for the sins of the whole world,‡ and that there is salvation for all,§ "that come unto God by him;"‖ as well as full restitution for all who die in infancy, and for all who never had sufficient sense to know good from evil.¶ There never was a period, gentlemen, when there were more false Christs, or, in other words, more false worship, than we have now; and at no time, therefore, was a declaration of pure principles more imperatively called for.

This Witness is of opinion, that neither the quantity of water, nor the manner of its application, is of much importance. But this is an error. It is essential to the right administration of the ordinance, that there be a sufficiency of it for the immersion of the whole body. Still there is no inherent efficacy in it. And were the Witness even to take a babe to the river Jordan, and baptize it therein, it would be no more benefited, than if he had, in his own pulpit, dipped his finger in a bowl of spring water, and sprinkled a few drops on its face. It is our bounden duty to endeavour "to keep the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace," but not at the expense of truth.**

The Ninth Witness said, "The church of Christ,... in a stricter sense,... consists of those who are vitally united to Christ, as the members of the body to the head; and who, being thus imbued with spiritual life, 'walk no longer after the flesh, but after the Spirit.'...

"It is obligatory on all who are convinced of the truth of christianity to be baptized....

"If baptism be the door of admission into the church, some must judge of the fitness of the candidates, and administrators of the rite must be appointed....

"The church is a society founded upon faith, and united by mutual love for the personal edification of its members in holiness, and for the religious benefit of the world.... It cannot employ force

* James v. 20, Acts xx. 26. † Jer. vi. 14. ‡ 1 John ii. 2.
§ Isa. xlv. 22. ‖ Heb. vii. 25. ¶ Rom. iv. 15. ** See Rev. ii. 20.

to compel men into its pale; for the only door of the church is faith, to which there can be no compulsion. He that believeth, and is baptized, becomes a member....

"Members ... are bound to keep themselves separate from the world, ... except in the ordinary and courteous intercourse of life.*...

"The saving benefits of the covenant of grace are made expressly to depend upon a true faith.†...

"The *obligation* of baptism rests upon the example of our Lord, who, by his disciples, baptized many that by his discourses and miracles were brought to profess faith in him as the Messiah.‡...

"Baptism we call a federal transaction; an initiation into, and acceptance of, the covenant of grace, required of us by Christ as a visible expression and act of that faith in him which he has made a condition of salvation. It is a point, however, of so much importance, to establish the covenant character of this ordinance, and so much of the controversy as to the proper subjects of baptism depends upon it, that we may consider it somewhat at large.§...

"All nations are now to be brought into the church of God,... by baptizing them that believe the good news, and accept the terms of the new covenant....

"Baptism was expressly made the initiatory rite by which believers of all nations were to be introduced into the church and covenant of grace.||...

"Baptism is not... a mere external ceremony, but a rite which *demands* or *requires* something of us.... What that is, we learn from the words of our Lord; it is faith in Christ. He that *believeth*, and is baptized, shall be saved....

"We know, however, from the instance of Philip and the eunuch, that there was an explicit *requirement of faith*, and as explicit an answer or confession....

"Baptism is the outward sign of our entrance into God's covenant of mercy; and that, when it is an act of true faith, it becomes an instrument of salvation, like that act of faith in Noah, by which, when moved with fear, he 'prepared an ark to the saving of his house.'...

"Baptism ... is made obligatory upon all nations to whom the gospel is preached, and is to continue to the end of the world.¶...

"Baptism ... is *our seal*, also; it is that act by which we make

* Pages 341—343. † Page 385. ‡ Page 390.
§ Page 391. || Page 398. ¶ Pages 402—404.

ourselves parties to the covenant, and thus 'set to our seal that God is true.'...

"In baptism, also, we undergo a mystical death unto sin; a mystical separation from the world, which St. Paul calls being 'buried with Christ, in or by baptism;' and a mystical resurrection to newness of life, through Christ's resurrection from the dead....

"Baptism is the grand initiatory act, by which we enter into the covenant, in order to claim all its spiritual blessings, and to take upon ourselves all its obligations....

"Faith in Christ is also an indispensable condition for baptism, in all persons of mature age.... Hence the administration of baptism was placed by our Lord only in the hands of those who were to preach the gospel,...and to teach them to observe all things, whatsoever Christ had commanded them."*

Now, gentlemen, I appeal to you, can any one of his eighteen propositions be made to quadrate with the christening of an infant? Do not all of them accord with the baptism of a believer? Does not this part of his evidence confute all that he had previously advanced, and make it altogether in our favour? Nor is there, in any of his propositions, a semblance of an "involuntary mistake." It is clear that his views of baptism are at variance with his practice, and opposed to his prejudices. Or how else can we account for his tergiversations? He has not dared to assert that baptism was administered originally in any other way than as it is now administered by the Defendants; yet, gentlemen, you have heard how, in the beginning of his evidence, he vilified it—how he proclaimed his rancorous hatred of it, as observed and commanded by the Testator, and as practised by his disciples. "It is," said he, "repulsive to the feelings, dangerous to the health, and offensive to delicacy; it is destitute of all scriptural authority, and of really primitive practice."

And mark, gentlemen, how he applied a salvo to his conscience, for using such irreverent language: "Even," said he, "if immersion had been in fact the original mode of baptizing in the name of Christ, these reasons, added to the *exceeding harshness* of immersing the candidates, male and female, strong and feeble, in water, make it *improbable* that no accommodation of form should take place without vitiating the ordinance."

However, we must give him all the merit he deserves. There is

* Pages 406—409.

much truth in his propositions, and no greater truth than this, that "THE CHURCH consists of those who are united to Christ, as the members of the body are to the head." Consequently, the government of it must be vested in the members; for, as was prophesied of old, "their nobles shall be of themselves, and their governor shall proceed from the midst of them."* They are therefore bound, under a heavy penalty,† to see that no errors "creep" into it; or, if any have crept in, to follow the example of the Levites under Josiah, to "sanctify the house of the Lord God,... and carry forth the filthiness out of the holy place."‡ The line of demarcation between the church and the congregation is now as manifest as, under the old dispensation, it was between Jews and Gentiles; the former only were privileged to enter the inner court of the house. But the believer, the baptized in Christ, has the privilege to enter within the vail, into the holiest;"§ into which no unbaptized person is allowed admittance, or to have a voice in anything respecting it. Now no one, at all conversant with the Will, can regard this remark as either unscriptural, illiberal, or harsh. The very circumstance of their remaining without is a sufficient proof of their unfitness to assist in the solemn deliberation of an assembly of saints. Were it otherwise, it would introduce into the church "the doctrine of Balaam, who taught Balak to cast a stumbling block before the children of Israel," and would be the first step towards what the world calls "open communion." The conversation of some persons would lead to the conclusion that to enter, even into the outer court, was doing God service;|| and nothing is more common with them, if anything take place which is opposed to their will, than to put off one form of religion, as they do their garment, and clothe themselves with another, as a token of their dissatisfaction with that which they have laid aside.

The Tenth Witness said, "I shall beg leave to remind our opponents of some principles in one of their own writers, which may be of use to them. 'The scriptures are our only sure guide in matters of religion. Our obligations, in regard to faith and practice, extend only to those things which are noted in the scriptures of truth. Our practice in 'positive institutes' must be regulated by what is 'expressly' and 'explicitly noted in the scriptures of truth.' Now, on these principles let them prove the doctrine of

* Jer. xxx. 21. † See Rev. ii. 14—16. ‡ 2 Chron. xxix. 5.
§ Heb. x. 19, 20. || See Ps. l. 16.

dipping, and they will do far better than they have ever yet done. But let them remember they will be expected to keep to the point, and furnish some evidence that they have read the Greek New Testament on the subject.... And now, gentlemen, having troubled you so long, I shall take my leave by relating a whale-fishing story: I have been told that, at the commencement of this trade, an amazing number of lives were lost by the following circumstance: whenever the whale came to the top of the water, after receiving the harpoon, she immediately aimed a stroke with her tail at the boat, and often sent the whole crew to the bottom. At last, however, they invented this stratagem, to preserve their lives: having provided themselves with a sufficient number of tubs, they no sooner struck a whale, than they hove out a few of these; and the whale, mistaking the tubs for the boat, spent her strength in beating them to pieces, and the boat was preserved.

"Now, gentlemen, controversies of this kind are the devil's tubs; and so long as our opponents and I spend our strength on these, Satan's kingdom will be safe. But I hope the world will take no offence at the mild, and merciful, and peaceful religion of the blessed Jesus, because 'there is sometimes a strife among the disciples who shall be accounted greatest.' They well know that on these two commandments, love to God, and love to our neighbour, hang all the law and the prophets, and that the minister who does not bend all his force to this point, and make all his ministrations bear on this great object, mistakes the end of his office. Yes, our great business is to do good, and promote peace, by preaching the gospel of the kingdom. We are to be peace-makers, and not pests to society.."*

Gentlemen, as I have before remarked,

"A little learning is a dangerous thing."

Of this you have had ample proof in the testimony of this Witness. If the knowledge of Greek were monopolised by our opponent, we might here resign the contest, and concede to him the victory; but when we find a person boasting of his own attainments, a suspicion is engendered that they are superficial. What saith the Plaintiffs' leading Witness, a man universally acknowledged to be a sound classical scholar? Why this; "that the translators, under the direction of king James I., ... have seized the very spirit and soul of the original, and expressed this almost everywhere with pathos and energy;

* Pages 52—55.

that the Divine Providence has so ordered it, that although, ... in various MSS. and ancient versions ... of the Bible, a number of mistakes have been committed, by careless *copyists* as well as careless printers, not an essential truth of God has been injured or suppressed. In this respect all is perfect, and the way of the Most High is rendered so plain, that the wayfaring man, though a fool, utterly destitute of deep learning and critical abilities, need not err therein."*

That our opponents are fearful of controversy, and are convinced that their doctrines are untenable, is clearly manifested from their own writings. It is even on record that my learned friend has said, "We dread the effects of controversy getting lower down in the church; and we believe this will be best prevented, not of course by keeping church principles out of sight, but by taking them for granted, and by so weaving them in their proper place and proportion into every book that is written, and into every good character that is drawn, that truth may be seen whole, and thus one part of it may justify, as we are persuaded it then always will justify, another." And why this dread? "Lest in combatting overmuch the errors of our own times," modern writers "should lead the poor and little instructed to mix themselves up too much in these matters, instead of leading them out of them as insensibly as may be."†

Truly, gentlemen, this is a very pretty and dexterous device, plausible, no doubt, to the clergy: but will all churchmen, even, take for granted that church principles, as they are termed, are true? It must be evident to my learned friend that many do not, or he would not have left this paragraph on record. Equally evident must it be to him, that his device will not stop the pen of "modern writers," nor be a means of preventing the illiterate from exercising their own judgment, and speaking their own minds freely on the things which of all others most nearly concern them.

The moral which this Witness draws from the whale-fishing story may be correct, so long as the controversy on both sides is conducted after the manner of the world; but, gentlemen, when it is conducted after the manner of the Testator and his apostles, it is a harpoon in the side of the evil one, which enrages him; and by his tail, which may typify false prophets and all enemies of the gospel,‡ he lashes the waters; but the boat, the ark of safety, in which sits the skilful

* See his Introduction to the Gospels, page 10.

† British Critic, April, 1842, page 405. ‡ See Isa. ix. 15.

harpooner, is too buoyant to be swamped by his most powerful efforts.

Gentlemen, "Christianity was planted, and has grown up, in storms; discussion is always favourable to it, and has ever been so. Let the wintry blast come: it will but scatter the sere leaves, and snap off the withered branches. The giant tree will only strike its root deeper in the soil, and in the coming spring time put forth richer foliage, and extend a more grateful shade." Thus the people of God, so beautifully and sublimely represented by the fire in the bush,* are miraculously preserved; and however the fire of persecution may rage in the midst of them, their integrity remains unconsumed; because "the Lord is in the midst" of them also.

The royal law, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind,... and thy neighbour as thyself,"† may be regarded as an epitome of the whole scriptures. If we had for each other and for ourselves the love here inculcated, we could not commit sin; for all sin is either an injury to our neighbour, to ourselves, or to both.‡ What love to God is, I have before shown, by quoting John xiv. 21. How little, gentlemen, have we seen of the fulfilment of this love to him, in the statements of the Plaintiffs!

Peace, gentlemen, when upheld by a compromise of "the truth," is not the peace which the gospel inculcates, but that sort of peace which was the ruin of the church of Laodicea, the major part of the members of which, we may suppose, were mere carnal professors; and the few among them who were loved, rebuked, and chastened, instead of separating themselves, remained, no doubt for the sake of peace, and from the fear of giving offence, silent and lukewarm; until, by degrees, they became so tainted with the prevailing errors, as to give the whole church the appearance of a dead body. Between those who promulgate error, gentlemen, and those who, for the sake of peace, suppress the truth, the difference is very slight.

"If tranquillity can be obtained, in connexion with the advancement of truth, it is well; but if the alternative be, that peace or principle must be abandoned, the path of duty is clear, or apostles and prophets have died in vain."

You have observed, gentlemen, that some of the Witnesses never once mentioned the glorious promise, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved;" yet, notwithstanding, it is the principal

* Exod. iii. 2. † Matt. xxii. 37—40. ‡ See Rom. xiii. 7—10.

text, the right comprehension of which, determines the heirship to the kingdom. Whether they were ignorant that their evidence would be required upon it, or were sensible that, if they had endeavoured to explain it, they would have ruined their cause, it is for them to explain. This text, gentlemen, clearly defines the title to the privilege of being, as the fulfilling it constitutes an individual, an heir of God; and while any one remains ignorant of this text, he cannot expect to be a partaker of its blessings. This, on scriptural grounds, is irrefragable. The ordinance of baptism was instituted by God, and made, according to the commission of his well-beloved Son, a requisite to salvation.

When the Testator commissioned his disciples to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. He did not say, He that believeth shall be saved; but he said, "He that believeth AND is baptized shall be saved." All who look up to the Testator as their Saviour, must believe all he says, and that he says what he means; and his meaning doubtless is, not only that salvation is attached to the observance of whatsoever he commands, but that without that observance salvation is unattainable.

It is now a common practice for people to search the Will rather to discover how many commands they may disregard and still be saved, than to ascertain distinctly what is required of them. And, as my learned friend has truly remarked in another place, "There exists a growing reference to the sincerity, or even the scruples of men, rather than to the revealed will of God, as a ground of duty."* With many, baptism takes the lead in what they call non-essentials; although, after the Testator had commissioned his immediate disciples to baptize all nations, there is nothing expressed in the Will, by which we may conclude that, during their ministry, they encouraged any unbaptized person to look for salvation independent of it. What reason then have they to look for anything different now? "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body... whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."†

I will now call your attention, gentlemen, to the miraculous deliverance of Israel from Egypt, a miracle beyond conception, when we consider that there was "not one feeble person among their tribes,"‡ which consisted of from two to three millions of people; every indi-

* Lectures on Church of England. † 1 Cor. xii. 13.

‡ Psalm cv. 37.

vidual, man, woman, and child, being strong and healthy, together with their cattle, and ready at a few hours' notice to journey, without leaving "an hoof behind."* That all the dealings of God with Israel of old were of a typical character, few will question; his true Israel, then, his own elect, shall be ready, after the same manner, when "the last trump" shall sound, to obey the summons of their Lord. Following out the figure, then, as the former were delivered in a perfect state of body, the latter shall be delivered in a perfect state of soul. For they only can enter into eternal glory who "stand perfect and complete in all the will of God."† Now as all the saints will thus undoubtedly stand, at the last day, must not every individual who has been, or ever may be, chosen of God, during the period intervening between the ascension of the Testator and his second coming, stand in like manner? Is the "Lord's hand shortened, that it cannot save"‡ his people, with the same ease, individually as collectively? And can any individual stand perfect and complete in all that will, who has lived in the neglect of any precept of it, and died without fulfilling "all righteousness,"§ and without having been "born of water and of the Spirit."‖

I may be allowed to remark, gentlemen, in reply to the taunt of the last Witness respecting the reading of the New Testament in Greek, that although some words have not been translated into the vernacular language, and that ONE in particular, the meaning of which is one of the subjects of this trial, yet that word, BAPTIZE, stands, in numerous instances, in such a connexion with other words, that no unprejudiced person, who searches the scriptures in the sincerity of his heart, can mistake its true meaning. Thus hath the all-wise Creator been pleased to put every man in this country, who has the Bible in his hand, and is capable of reading it, on the same level; to each he has given the opportunity of knowing his word, as he gave to those who heard it from the lips of his well-beloved Son; yea, a far more favourable opportunity than they had during the time he was upon the earth, because they were not then "able to bear it;" but by the down-pouring of the Spirit, we are "guided into all truth," even as they afterwards were.

We have no ground to imagine that, in our day, the Testator chooses men to teach his word on account of their earthly wisdom,

* See Exod. x. 26.

† Col. iv. 12. See also Psalm xviii. 32, and the margin in Luke vi. 40.

‡ Isa. lix. 1. § Matt. iii. 15. ‖ John iii. 5.

any more than he did when he was personally present; for how few among the learned of the present time have been taught "as the truth is in Jesus."* The apostles, although they had the Old Testament in two languages, required only their own native tongue to enable them to teach their fellow-countrymen; it was not until they were sent to teach all nations, that they were endowed with the gift of tongues. We are, as the apostles at first were, opposed by men of our own nation; men whose much learning has drawn their minds from "the simplicity that is in Christ;"† men who are "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth;"‡ men who do not "recognize the sufficiency of the Spirit's teaching, as it is imparted to private individuals, to discover to them the way of salvation, or to qualify for all the duties of the christian ministry." But in what, except in speaking with tongues and working miracles, is there any difference between the Spirit's teaching now, and its teaching during the time of the apostles? It is the same Spirit that is given to all believers, and its teachings are doubtless the same. Peter said to a mixed multitude, whom he accused of crucifying the Lord, "Repent,...and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."§ And the Testator said to his apostles, "Go ye...and teach all nations, baptizing them....Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world."‖ This promise certainly includes all who should thereafter believe in Christ, and walk according to his teaching and that of his apostles. But then it does not follow that every believer shall have a gift for the ministry. On the contrary, few in the present day have it; and where that gift is not bestowed, not all the universities in the world can impart it. There are, as we see 1 Cor. xii. 1—16, diversities of gifts. Moses, the great type of the Testator, was a man "slow of speech;" while Aaron, his brother, God's high priest, was an eloquent man, and was made of the Lord Moses' spokesman.¶ There are no true ministers but those who are raised up of God.** And the Testator returned thanks to his heavenly Father because he has "hid these things from the wise and prudent, and has revealed them unto babes."†† Surely, then, it is to such babes—such unlet-

* Eph. iv. 21. † 2 Cor. xi. 3. ‡ 2 Tim. iii. 7.
§ Acts ii. 38. ‖ Matt. xxviii. 20. ¶ Exod. iv. 10. 14.
** See Jer. iii. 15; xxiii. 4; Ezek. xxxiv. 23; Rom. x. 15; Eph. iv. 11, 12.
†† Matt. xi. 25.

tered men, as, by being baptized with the Spirit, and paying attention to the simple dictates of the Will, are free from the prejudices of education, and attain to the true understanding of it. Those among them who have the suitable gift, therefore, are the best able to minister it to others;* and to show before the world whether the Plaintiffs or the Defendants are entitled to the bequest.

By the substitution of the word *Protestant* for "Papist," I am ably seconded, in the sentiments just advanced, by a very high authority, an authority often quoted by our opponents of the Establishment, even Bishop Ridley. He says, "All Popish things," (say Protestant,) for the most part, "are of man's invention; whereas they ought to have the Holy Scriptures for the only rule of faith....But how are the scriptures, say they, to be understood? St. Augustine answereth, giving this rule: 'The circumstances of the scriptures,' saith he, 'lighten the scriptures; and so one scripture doth expound another to a man that is studious, well willing, and often calling upon God in continual prayer, who giveth his Holy Spirit to them that desire it of him.' So that the scripture is not of any private interpretation at any time. For such a one, though he be a layman, fearing God, is much more fit to understand holy scripture, than an arrogant and proud priest; yea, than the bishop himself, be he never so great, and glistering in all his pontificals. But what is to be said of the fathers? How are they to be esteemed? St. Augustine answereth, giving this rule also; 'that we should not, therefore, think it true because they say so, do they never so much excel in holiness or learning; but if they be able to prove their saying by the canonical scriptures, or by good probable reason, meaning that to be probable reason, as I think, which doth orderly follow upon a right collection and gathering out of the scriptures.'

"Let the Papists,"—say Protestants, "go with their long faith; be you contented with the short faith of the saints, which is revealed unto us by the word of God written....For one man having the scripture, and good reason for him, is more to be esteemed himself alone, than a thousand such as they, either gathered together or succeeding one another. The fathers have both herbs and weeds; and Papists commonly gather the weeds, and leave the herbs."† And cannot you, gentlemen, by experience say, that Protestants follow their example?

Do not, gentlemen, for a moment suppose that I wish to depreciate

* See 1 Peter iv. 10. † The Voice of the Glorious Reformation, pp. 59—61.

the value of learning. I do not! It is the perversion of learning which I deprecate; a perversion of which you, while sitting in that box, have had superabundance of proof. Learning, gentlemen, is not only the grand pioneer to clear the way for the spread of the gospel, but to it also we are indebted for the translation of the scriptures, and the preservation of that translation in its purity. Nevertheless, it is rare to find men of learning attain to the true understanding of them. Hear what the Fourth Witness, in his cross-examination, has said; "Deep thinkers and highly gifted persons are *seldom* favoured with such joy and peace in believing, as are experienced by common minds. "Therefore, when I make light of it, it is only for the purpose of showing its utter insufficiency of itself, either to attain to, or to communicate, spiritual knowledge; 'for the world by wisdom knew not God.'* Perverted literature is one of the most powerful weapons in the hand of the enemies of divine truth, who leave no effort untried to recommend their cause by the lustre of superior acquisitions, and to form in the public mind the dangerous association between irreligion and talents, weakness and piety."† "We," says Mr. Jay, "do not undervalue literature; let it always have its due praise; *but let it never be supposed for one moment that the mathematics and the classics can do the work of God, in the pulpit, or out of it.*"

Gentlemen, we are accused by the Plaintiffs of a want of charity; but I think they must allow that, so far as respects infants, the accusation is unjust, as I have before frequently shown. And I appeal to you, and to every one in the court, to decide which of the parties concerned in this trial manifest the greatest portion of it; whether the Defendants, who assert that our Lord's commission is addressed to such persons only as are of sufficient age to be capable of understanding it, but that all who die in infancy, "of every kindred, tongue, and people, and nation," shall nevertheless be redeemed from the power of the grave, and enjoy eternal happiness, by virtue of their federal union to Christ; or the Plaintiffs, who, by the tenor of their evidence, imply that christening them is, in some way or other, essential to their salvation, and that the omission of it, in consequence of the neglect or ignorance of their parents, subjects them to temporary or everlasting punishment?

Infants, gentlemen, like the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda, are wholly helpless, and in every thing concerning themselves pas-

* 1 Cor. i. 21. † Robert Hall.

sive. And, as he remained unhealed of his natural infirmities, for the want of some compassionate person to put him into the water, so, according to the Plaintiffs, unless some kind friend take care to have them christened, they die unhealed of what they call their original apostacy. What idea can be more uncharitable! what conduct more inhuman, hard-hearted, or unpardonable than that of these parties, who, although they maintain the infinite importance of the ceremony, yet refuse to administer it to those innocents who have been born of parents whom they denominate unbelievers.

If anything done for an innocent being (and all infants are regarded by their Creator as innocent,) could in any respect give it a preference over its fellows, the Lord would not only be a respecter of persons, but would receive or reject individuals at the will of his creatures. Well may he say to the Plaintiffs, "My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways."*

Gentlemen, I have now shown, and I trust to your satisfaction, that there has not been a single thing advanced in favour of the Plaintiffs' cause, which derives the least support from the Will. The arguments and reasonings on which their Witnesses have laid the greatest stress, I have shown to be neither conclusive nor convincing. In short, that the whole of their evidence furnishes a manifest proof that their system is based upon probabilities, carried up by conjectures, completed by assumptions, and upheld by prejudices. Indeed, gentlemen, from what we have heard, we can scarcely imagine anything too incredible for our opponents to utter. It is within the last few years that I have read of the celebrated founder of a sect, second, so far as respects numbers, to none in England save one, who, after he had preached for thirty years, wondered, when he looked back at all the incoherent stuff he had uttered, that his hearers had not stoned him: and who, after he had been a professed minister for a length of time, confessed to a friend, that he did not experimentally know what faith was, and consulted him whether he should still continue to preach it. "Go on, to be sure," said his friend; "preach faith until you have faith; and when you have it, you will be sure to preach it."

It must have been well impressed upon your minds, gentlemen, that when these Witnesses spoke positively to the meaning of any text, that meaning strengthened our cause; and also that they brought nothing forward in favour of that of the Plaintiffs, but what

* Isa. lv. 8.

was contingent upon some uncertainty or other, or was supported by presumptions; while not one of them spoke in the language of appropriation, or gave you any reason to imagine that he knew himself to be a fellow-labourer with those "whose names are written in the book of life."* Seeing this is the case, then, you cannot have been surprised that some of them have even expressed doubts of the justness of their claim; and that others of them have made it appear that they neither understand the full and free proclamation of the Will, nor its true bearing.

Allow me, gentlemen, to remark, before I take my leave of these Witnesses, that although my comments on their conflicting and unscriptural evidence have made it obvious that the Plaintiffs, according to the showing of their Witnesses, have no claim, yet I do not desire your verdict, unless I prove our title to be as clear as I have proved their's to be defective. "It is," you will allow, "necessary for a man who pursues truth, to inquire into the springs of error."† And, seeing, as my learned friend has said in another place,‡ that "error may be demolished by the exposure of its inconsistency, but that that process is not enough to supply its place with truth," I am therefore bound to prove our claim to be indisputable, which, through divine aid, I doubt not I shall accomplish, to the satisfaction of every unprejudiced mind; and thus not only justify your verdict in our favour, but render that verdict irreversible. If our title depended upon the mere testimony of men, I might here close our case, and demand it upon the following evidence, given in favour of my clients by their most inveterate opponents, the Plaintiffs' own Witnesses; all of whom, either directly or indirectly, have admitted baptism and immersion to be synonymous terms, and that we have been baptized according to the commission.

The First Witness said, "It is probable that those who were baptized in Ænon put themselves under water"—

That "the three thousand, on the day of Pentecost, were ALL converted and baptized"—

That "the eunuch probably plunged himself"—

That "to be baptized in the name of the Lord (speaking of Cornelius and his house,) implied the taking upon them the public profession of christianity, and believing on Christ Jesus as their Saviour"—

That "the jailer and ALL his house were baptized in consequence of their faith"—

* Phil. iv. 3. † Dr. Watts. ‡ British Critic, April, 1838, page 377.

That "Crispus believed in the Lord, with ALL his house"—

That "the FAMILY of Stephanas were probably converted and baptized by the apostle himself"—

That "Lydia and her WHOLE family were baptized in faith"—

That Col. ii. 12, alludes "to the immersion practised by adults, when the persons appeared to be buried under water; and the immerging from the water was an emblem of the resurrection of the body"—

That, (according to 1 Cor. xv. 29,) "they receive baptism as an emblem of death, BY VOLUNTARILY GOING UNDER THE WATER. So they receive it as an emblem of the resurrection unto eternal life, IN COMING UP OUT OF THE WATER"—

That "as our Lord considers a little child an emblem of a genuine disciple, so by the term 'one such little child,' he means a disciple only."

The Second Witness said, "the eunuch *went down into the water, and was baptized by Philip*"—

That "faith only gives a right to baptism, and entitles to salvation"—

That (speaking of the jailer,) "he does not deny the lawfulness of baptizing by immersion"—

That "Crispus and his HOUSE were brought to believe"—

That "Stephanas and his HOUSE were converted to christianity"—

That (according to 1 Cor. x. 1,) "their passage seemed to be BURIED in the waters, as persons of that age were PUT UNDER WATER when they were baptized"—

That "there is *no doubt* but the apostle alludes, in Rom. vi. 3, to the putting persons UNDER WATER, and raising them again OUT OF THE WATER"—

That "our Saviour, to cure the pride and ambition of his disciples, set before them a little child, assuring them that unless they turn from their pride and ambition, and become as a little child, they cannot be saved"—

That "all those who would be accepted of God, must believe in Christ with the heart, and openly confess with the mouth that he is the Son of God"—

That "divine institution is as necessary to a sacrament, as the royal inscription is to current money."

The Third Witness said, "That IMMERGING the body of the baptized in water, represents the burial of a dead person under ground; and the EMERGING again figures new life"—

That " every unbeliever and every sinner, *although made by baptism* (christening) *a member of Christ, and a child of God*, must be in a certain sense converted, if he would ultimately succeed to his inheritance."

The Fourth Witness said, that " Paul and Silas instructed the jailer and all his family into the doctrines of the gospel "—

That " Crispus, with ALL his family, were converted, and received into the church by baptism "—

That " the SEVERAL persons belonging to the family of Stephanas were QUALIFIED for usefulness," and that " they were the oldest converts to christianity in Achaia "—

That " there is no proof of there being ANY children in Lydia's family "—

That " the Church of Christ is within the ark; into this ark none enter but by faith. This faith both Jew and Gentile professed, when by BAPTISM they were admitted into the christian church "—

That " Christ did not, indeed, order these infants (those which were brought to him) to be baptized."

The Fifth Witness said, " Cornelius and his household were baptized in consequence of their faith; also, that to be baptized in the name of Christ is to make a public profession of faith in him "—

That " that which, on the part of mankind, makes them God's children, is their OWN VOLUNTARY GIFT OF THEMSELVES."

The Sixth Witness admits immersion to be valid baptism. That " the phrase ' of such ' means, beyond all question, persons possessing the disposition of children, and that infants may be acknowledged to be of the kingdom of God, without baptizing them."

The Seventh Witness says, " Independents have found little or no fault with the principles and practice of anti-pedobaptism. They have said (some of them at least,) that *immersion* was no doubt *baptism*."

The Eighth Witness " pretends to no certainty that John did not dip "—

That " the jailer and his whole family were taught, converted, and baptized."

The Ninth Witness said, " The HOUSEHOLDS of Cornelius, the jailer, Crispus, and Stephanas are mentioned as HEARING and BELIEVING "—

That " believers are the proper subjects of baptism is beyond dispute "—

That "the saving benefit of the covenant of grace is made expressly to depend on a true faith"—

That "the only door of the church is faith: 'he that believeth and is baptized,' becomes a member"—

That "Noah's entering into the ark was the visible expression of his faith; and for this reason baptism is called by St. Peter the antitype of this transaction, the one answering to the other, as an external expression of faith"—

That "the intention of Christ, (when he took a child and set him by him,) was to impress the necessity of humility and teachableness upon his disciples."

The First, Fifth, and Ninth Witnesses said, that "the apostles understood by their commission that they were to instruct their hearers BEFORE baptizing them."

The First, Second, and Third Witnesses, that "the Testator instructed his disciples that THEY should BECOME as little children."

Gentlemen, from what you have heard in this Court, you have experienced the impossibility that a number of Witnesses, of different persuasions, testifying to a diversity of circumstances, should so concur in a tale which has not truth for its basis, as to impose upon any one. When Witnesses not only contradict each other, but each one contradicts himself, it is sufficient to convince a jury that the parties who subpœnaed them are not entitled to the thing which they seek to obtain.

REPLY TO THE PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL.

Gentlemen, said the Counsel for the Defendants, as the chief points which the Plaintiffs came here to maintain have, by their own Witnesses, been abandoned to us; and as I have replied to, and confuted, all their statements and arguments, not only out of their own mouths, but by the Will of the Testator, I shall now endeavour to do the same by those of my learned friend. I freely admit that, among his own party, he is deemed most popular; but I cannot add, deservedly so. He must not, however, take offence at a junior counsel, however unequal to him in worldly esteem, learning, and oratory, treating him with all the freedom and familiarity which the magnitude of the case requires, and with which, for the same reason, I have treated his Witnesses. When the interest of the church of Christ is at stake, the dread of giving offence must be disregarded; for none can defend that interest without giving offence,* seeing that everywhere it is spoken against.† He who undertakes this mighty cause must be unflinching, and boldly speak the whole truth, fearless of consequences,‡ and "of that terrible lion in the path, the world's dread laugh." It is a war in which there is no truce, no compromise, no discharge. He who enlists under the Great Captain, must maintain his allegiance to his dying day. He must be prepared to endure to be stigmatised as presumptuous, dogmatic, self-opinionated, uncharitable, and narrow-minded; to stand as a mark for the shafts of calumny, hatred, envy, and clamour. And for this reason, gentlemen, that he "bears witness unto the truth;" and, by so doing, shows his sentiments to be in advance of the age he lives in. But if the prophecies of scripture are true, let but one hundred and fifty, or two hundred years roll over, and these sentiments will be hailed by the inhabitants of the whole earth;§ while those of his opponents, as registered in

* Matt. xiii. 57. † Acts xxviii. 22.

‡ See Jer. i. 17; Jer. xxvi. 2; Matt. xxviii. 20; Acts xx. 27.

§ See Hab. ii. 14; Jer. xxxi. 34.

this court, will be a standing monument of the ignorance, the folly, the superstition, and the prejudice of past ages.*

It was said by an ancient writer, that "he who opposes his own judgment against the consent of the times, ought to be backed with unanswerable truths; and he that hath truth on his side is a fool, as well as a coward, if he is afraid to own it, because of the currency or multitude of other men's opinions." And I will here, gentlemen, take the liberty of borrowing a paragraph from a publication of my learned friend. "The man who presses forward *any* deep truth, whatever his particular view of it may be, is deemed an intruder; not in reference to *what* he says, for that is not carefully examined; but in reference to his saying *any* thing which every body does not say. It would not, indeed, sound well to bring the real accusation against him; to wit, that he is a searcher into more of the truth of God than is usually brought forward, and that he proclaims what he knows with the boldness of honest enthusiasm, uncaring consequences: this were an honourable charge. It suits better with the temper of the times to charge him with a breach of love, a want of brotherly kindness, a harsh, Ishmaelitish spirit." ‖

Gentlemen, if the Plaintiffs' cause had been a just one, my learned friend would indeed have had occasion to glory in being retained to maintain it: but its injustice was manifest in the want of that straightforward and manly bearing, which is shown by a counsel who is master of his subject, confident in the righteousness of his undertaking, and inspired with the presentiment of victory. Pitiable indeed must be that cause, whose advocate, intent on putting the best face on his client's claim, makes use of the following language, some of which is truly ridiculous: "Baptism is the SURER. If we baptize infants, and they ought not to be baptized, our baptizing them, if it can do them no good, can *do them no hurt;* but if they *ought* to be baptized, and we do not baptize them, we do them inconceivable hurt." And again, "But should I be mistaken, the result would only be that the New Testament *is without an instance of infant baptism.*" And again, "It is not fair ... of our opponents to demand an instance of infant baptism in the days of the apostles." And again, "Our mother, the church, lends them (infants) the feet of others, that they may come; and the heart of others, that they may believe; the tongue of others, that they may confess; that seeing they are burdened by another's sin, they may be

* See Isa. xxviii. 16—21. † M'Neile's Lectures on the Jews, page 12.

saved by another's confession." Nor would a wise counsel peril his cause by asserting,—"The practice, by immersing the person under water, thereby burying him, as it were, in the water, and raising him out of it, was anciently the more usual method:" or that, "Faith and baptism are the two means of salvation, adhering together and inseparable. Faith is made perfect by baptism: baptism is dependent on faith.... Indeed, confession goes before, leading to salvation; but baptism follows, *sealing* our confession and covenant."

And, gentlemen, is it not unreasonable of my learned friend to assert, that it "is unfair of us to demand an instance of infant baptism in the days of the apostles." Does he imagine that the jury will give him a verdict, without proof of the justice of his cause? No. Indeed, he not only implies that the gospel affords no such instance, but unequivocally affirms that confession precedes baptism. He, too, like each of his Witnesses, is at variance with himself. He first proves to you, that, according to the Will, repentance and faith are required previous to baptism; then he turns round, and asserts, that "It is remarkable that the clearest passage, as to the necessity of faith before baptism, Acts viii. 37, should be an interpolation, as if to show that the strongest arguments of the Baptists, the necessity of faith, can only be received by the same inferential reasoning which they reject as proving infant baptism." And, like them, he argues as if all who bring their children to be christened are believers, and asks, "Who, then, may refuse them admittance into the church?" although, in the previous breath, he had declared that baptism had become a delusion, and "that the chief proportion of the christened are far off from God." Notwithstanding he christens all that are brought to him — gives them a certificate of their meetness for confirmation — and afterwards buries them as saints. Again, he asserts that the institution of sponsors is not an ordinance of God; next, he pretends to give you an express scriptural warrant for christening infants; and, a little while after, informs you that the rite "flows rather from inference than positive appointment." The warrant is, that infants are included in the commission, as making part of "all nations," and the inference that "the promise is to you and to your children." He says no age is specified. True; but the words of the commission exclude infants, and specify the age so far as to exclude all who are incapable of being taught. My learned friend does not see the difference between the immediate children of a parent, and the descendants of the whole Jewish and

Gentile race to the end of the world; and because we see it, he charges us with *stupid impudence*. He knows that Paul was of mature age when he addressed the people at Antioch, and said, "The promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us, their children."* And why does he denominate us anabaptists? Is it by the way of reproach? We never baptize again. Those who have been baptized in ignorance, we regard as Paul did those mentioned Acts xix. 1—5. But when a counsel uses intemperate language, it is obvious that he feels he is advocating a bad cause.

"The church," says my learned friend, "never received infant communion; but the church has ever held infant baptism. An infant may be capable of inheriting an estate, and yet quite incapable of enjoying it." There cannot be, gentlemen, a more incongruous statement. Infants, scripturally speaking, are incapable of baptism, baptism being an act of the will, a seal put to the confession of the mouth.† But they are capable of swallowing a little bread and wine; and if there be any virtue in the mere partaking of the elements, as many of our opponents imagine there is, why should they be forbidden to partake of that virtue?

What infant, gentlemen, is ever put in possession of an estate? When he arrives at years of maturity, then is he supposed capable of enjoying it, but not till then. The apostle Paul says, that "the heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all: but is under tutors and governors."‡ So none are made joint heirs with Christ, until they are made capable of appreciating and enjoying the "inheritance." Man, in the eye of God, stands upon his own responsibility. If he neglect the means of salvation, his will be the fault;§ and if he seek after it as for hid treasures, he will be certain to find it.‖ It is a doctrine of the Catholics, that "private judgment must obviously arise from the most inveterate prejudice, or from the wild conviction that it mattered not what a man believed, when he chose a guide that could not direct him."¶

And is not this the doctrine of my learned friend also? He says, "There is presumption, danger, and ambitious curiosity, in setting up our private opinion and interpretation against the unanimous testimony of the early christians." We wait his proof of their unanimity. But even if they had been unanimous, is that any

* Acts xiii. 32, 33. † John iii. 33; Rom. x. 10. ‡ Gal. iv. 1, 2.
§ Matt. xxiii. 37. ‖ Prov. ii. 1. 5; and i. 23. ¶ Berington.

reason why we should adopt their errors? or is it any reason why he himself, who has the same, and even a better opportunity of knowing the will of God than they had, should take their testimony for his guide? His statement evinces that he has no opinion of his own, and that he supposes the Will, independent of tradition, to be a dead letter.

But, gentlemen, we have the whole Will still with us, and no opinion of those whom he denominates the early christians can supersede the instructions and declarations of the Testator and his disciples. No: and we are justified in asserting the right of private opinion, seeing that it is by our own individual knowledge, as taught of God, that we must be saved.* What says the Testator to the Pharisees? "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God."† And also Paul of the Bereans? "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily whether those things were so: therefore many of them believed."‡ Consequently if it were not for the exercise of our own judgment, and our own individual knowledge of the book of life, as revealed by the Holy Spirit, we should be as our opponents are, "tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive."§ For what one man may say, another may unsay; sufficient examples of which you have had before you.

Gentlemen, I trust you will bear with me for again reminding you of the danger of being biassed by the opinions of great authorities; of men celebrated for deep erudition; of men who carry the people away with them; remembering what the Testator said, when he upbraided the cities which saw his works, "because they repented not"—"I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent."‖ And remembering also that no one is esteemed by the world but he who ministers to its prejudices. He who, on scriptural grounds, attempts to oppose them, is hated of all men, for the Lord's sake. ¶

Hear, gentlemen, what my learned friend has said in another place. "It is not so much that genuine christianity has increased, as that a spurious mixture, diluted down to the palate of the world, is passing current for the true."**

* Isa. liii. 11. † Matt. xxii. 29. ‡ Acts xvii. 11, 12.
§ Ehp. iv. 14. ‖ Matt. xi. 25. ¶ Matt. x. 22.
** M'Neile on Second Advent, page 114.

That the Plaintiffs' are doubtful of their own standing, is manifested by their dread of coming in contact with those who differ from them. My learned friend is quite right in his observations, that we believe that the commission, to be available, must be fulfilled to the letter. How his clients learn to fulfil it, he has informed you; and you have had convincing evidence of their mal-education, as well by what has fallen from my learned friend himself, as from the Second and Third Witnesses, all of whom were taught at the universities. And can you wonder at it, gentlemen, when it has been said, and by good authority too, "that the miserable theology which has sprung up in Oxford, and which is exercising a fearful influence upon the younger students, owes its origin to the prevalence of the scholastic system, a system which has always been opposed to the purity of the christian faith....We have thought much upon the subject. We have examined the evidence of history. We have found that the opinions of the great and good in past ages coincide with our own; and finally, we have gone through the training of Oxford; not unsuccessfully as regarded the competition for university honours, and the station and emolument to which they often lead; and have quitted college with a mind unembittered by any disappointment, unless it be that we were unable, like some of our more lynx-eyed contemporaries, to discover the church in Aristotle, and christianity in Plato."*

And, gentlemen, it has elsewhere been said, and by my learned friend himself,—no mean authority,—that "another cause of comparatively limited efficiency in our church, will be found in the want of adequate training in candidates for the ministry. A collegiate education, as commonly conducted, is not enough. It may indeed qualify for an examination of the original scriptures; for demonstrations of the genuineness, authenticity, and consequently inspiration of the sacred canon; for guarding against crude novelties in doctrine, or vulgarities in composition; for appreciating the blessings inseparable from subordination, and the consequent privilege to the christian, of sacrificing gladly all the eccentricities of individual liberty at the shrine of public order. These are invaluable qualifications....But a clergyman may be possessed of these in an eminent degree...and yet be fatally deficient in other respects, not less necessary for an adequate discharge of the ministerial office....There can be no question that the characteristic of the public ministrations of our church in England is rather defect than excess; rather classical

* Churchman's Monthly Review and Chronicle, Feb., 1842, page 81.

correctness than popular efficiency; rather the edification of the educated than the reclaiming of the ignorant."*

And my learned friend has asked, in another place, "Have not our chief schools, also, preparatory to the university education, very extensively disregarded scriptural instruction, and the great principles of the Reformation?"...And has he not also published, that "the young men go to the universities well versed in the writings of the learned heathen, but without any adequate acquaintance with the writings of the apostles? They derive perhaps the first views which interest them, of religion and of the church and its sacraments, from the Tracts for the Times....Had they been accustomed to analyse the Epistles of St. Paul, as strictly as they are taught to analyse a Greek play, they would at once have perceived the total discrepancy between the voice of infallible truth and that of plausible error, and the folly of asserting that all who have been baptized have received the inward grace of regeneration."† And again, "For a clergyman of our church to labour for a reunion with Rome,...would be to live in the spirit of perjury."† Now, gentlemen, allow me to ask, If for a clergyman so to labour be to live in the spirit of perjury, in what spirit does a clergyman live who denies baptismal regeneration?

Hearken, also, gentlemen, to what the Fourth Witness has said. "The neglect of this rule (1 Tim. v. 21,) in the exercise of ecclesiastical authority, has given its opponents one of the most plausible arguments against it....How far those concerned in ecclesiastical matters are culpable, in respect of 'laying hands suddenly' on improper persons, without due inquiry and circumspection, or from complaisance to superiors, or friends, or relations; and how far this rule is observed or violated in all its extent, every man's conscience must determine for himself....But it is certain that these things involve a responsibility of no ordinary magnitude, and that immense criminality must rest somewhere, as the multitude of ignorant, slothful, ambitious, avaricious, immoral, and heretical clergymen, who remain uncensured throughout the land, and in every part of the visible church, most manifestly proves. There must somewhere be those who are in this respect 'partakers of other men's sins,' and that in a most tremendous degree."‡

* Lectures on the Church of England, by the Rev. H. M'Neile, M.A., page 103.

† The Promised Glory of the Church of Christ, by the Rev. E. Bickersteth, Note, pages 37. 55.

‡ See his observations at the end of 1 Tim. ch. v.

I might ask, gentlemen, How much more of the glorious gospel of Christ is taught or learned in academies? and the answer of truth would be, Very little indeed! if we are to judge from the evidence of those who have been educated in them. It is not in the power of man to make a minister of Christ; for "how shall they preach except they be sent?"* Yet an older christian may instruct a younger one. Apollos was an eloquent man, a man mighty in the scriptures, a man whom Paul classed with himself; yet Apollos was taught "the way of God more perfectly,"† by a believing craftsman and his believing wife;—a humiliating reflection for the great ones of Oxford, Cambridge, and dissenting academies.

Notwithstanding, after a christian has been fitted by the Holy Spirit for that high station, his fellow-man may put a little polish upon him, which might undoubtedly make his manner of delivery more agreeable and acceptable to his hearers; but whether it would be of solid advantage to the minister may be questioned. "It is written in the prophets, They (the Lord's people,) shall be all taught of God."‡ How much more, then, shall his ministers be so taught. Yet this does not militate against their improving themselves, which those that have the means and the opportunity may, without the aid of public establishments, readily do, so as to be able to read well and impressively, and to speak grammatically, accurately, and free from vulgarisms. The Testator was anointed "to preach the gospel to the poor;"§ it must therefore be preached in language which the poor can understand.

My learned friend asserts, that "the Will is not put into our hands as an all-sufficient guide, to supersede a living voice,—and that no man has any scriptural right to disregard a ceremony of the church, however he personally dislikes it, or however inexpedient, or absurd, or vexatious he may consider it, merely because there is nothing concerning it in the Will; if so, it is clear it cannot be contradictory to the Will, and in which case the enactment of the ruler gives it the authority of the Will itself."

Well, gentlemen, and who is this ruler? The State. And how does it rule? This question is answered in a sermon, preached at the Archidiaconal Visitation, by the Rev. Rector Campbell, a neighbour of my learned friend's, as reported in the newspaper which I hold in my hand, to a few extracts from which I beg to call

* Rom. x. 15.
† Acts xviii. 26.
‡ John vi. 45.
§ Luke iv. 18.

your attention. "The Commons' House of Parliament need not necessarily contain one single member of the Church of England. In the Lords, the bishops of course must be members of the Church of England; and the Lord Chancellor cannot be a Romanist, but he and all the other temporal peers may be Dissenters. All alliance, therefore, between the conscience of the two houses of Parliament and the Church of England is entirely dissolved....Arguing upon the Church of England principle, and on the supposition that Parliament has a conscience with respect to the doctrines of the Church of England, we must protest against the endowment of any religion contrary to that of the Church: still more strongly must we object to the authorised teaching of errors which that Church denounces as 'blasphemous fables:' but in England the State has long ago conceded this principle, in every possible way. Maintaining that pure and reformed part of Christ's holy Catholic Church which is established in these realms as the true method of conveying religious instruction to the people, it has abandoned the duty of teaching nothing but what that church considers to be the truth; and, whilst acknowledging christianity to be part and parcel of the law of the land, has avowed by its acts that it has not a conscience with respect to the disputed points of dogmatic christian theology.... To illustrate my meaning, I would observe, that the legislature has established and endows Presbyterianism in Scotland, not because it is the true form of church government, but because it was the unconquerable will of the majority of the people of Scotland that it should be established and endowed. It has not established Popery in Ireland...because it was the unconquerable will of the Protestant majority of proprietors that a Protestant missionary church should be established there; but though the Protestant legislature of Ireland established a Protestant missionary church, it paid to the support of a Romish college at Maynooth....It pays to the support of Romish clergy in India, and all the colonies; supports an established Romish church and hierarchy in Canada; pays for the teaching of Arianism and Socinianism in Ireland, through the *Regium Donum;* and for the teaching of all grades of Protestant dissent, through the British and Foreign School Society, in Protestant Dissenting schools. If, therefore, the principle of a State conscience is to be fully carried out; if the State is to teach 'the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,' all payments whatsoever must be withdrawn, not only from the Romish college at Maynooth, but from the Romish clergy

everywhere; the *Regium Donum* must be withheld, and no further payments made to Protestant Dissenting schools; ... the alliance of Church and State might then be complete, and the consistency of a state conscience might then be fully preserved."*

The State, then, gentlemen, is the ruler of the Establishment,—a ruler which has avowed by its acts that it has not a conscience,—a ruler which does not, or cannot, distinguish between truth and error,—a ruler which supports an established Romish church and hierarchy in Canada, pays for the teaching of Arianism and Socinianism in Ireland, and for the teaching of all grades of Protestant dissent,—a ruler whose enactment, my learned friend informs the Court, gives it the authority of the Will itself,—a ruler on which, as by a slender golden thread, hangs my learned friend's cause; and when that thread shall break, and break it most assuredly will, his cause, even on his own showing, "is gone,"—a ruler who professes to teach the "one way" to eternal glory, and yet, according to the Rev. Rector, teaches, or causes to be taught, as many ways as there are religions in our isle. That there is only one way, is manifest. Hear, gentlemen, the declaration of the Most High; "I will give them one heart and ONE way, that they may fear me for ever, for the good of them and their children after them."†

Now attend, gentlemen, to the way in which my learned friend is answered, and by a supporter of the Anglican church too. "It were a point of intolerable ungodliness and madness, to think either that God hath left an imperfect doctrine; or that man were able to make that perfect which God left imperfect. Therefore the Lord has most straitly forbidden men that they neither add anything to, nor take anything from, his word, nor turn away from it either to the right hand or the left."‡

Gentlemen, has this ruler the power of adding to or taking from the will of an individual, which has been legally drawn up and attested? If he has not, with what consistency can he attempt to add to or take from the Will of God; more especially in the face of the denunciation contained in Rev. xxii. 18, 19?

We shall not differ from, but rather agree with, my learned friend, respecting what he calls "the Church" having authority to decree

* See Liverpool Mail, May 10th, 1845. † Jer. xxxii. 39; see also Eph. iv. 4, 5.

‡ Nowell's Catechism; extracted by the Rev. Charles Popham Miles, B.A., in 'An Apology for Evangelical Doctrines in the Anglican Church.'

rites and ceremonies; except in one expression, that it has scriptural authority to decree them. That it has this authority, he adduces no appropriate proofs. The ruler of the church he mentions, and of which he is a minister, established, and still upholds it; consequently, the ruler has a right to do what he will with his own. After all, gentlemen, the assertion of my learned friend is, according to Berington, of Popish origin, but expressed in stronger terms; the latter says, "We *believe* that Christ has given to the pastors of his church a power to make laws, which all the faithful are bound to obey."

Now, gentlemen, as we do not read in the Will of the appointment of archbishops, bishops, prebends, heads of houses, proctors, canons, rectors, vicars, priests, &c., nor of advowsons, nor of any such things as livings, nor of their being publicly bought and sold, nor of the buyer having the privilege of appointing a minister to the living so bought, nor of parishioners, nor of their being obliged to accept of the minister which the buyer of "the cure of souls" sets over them;—are we not therefore scripturally authorised to conclude, that the counsel of this work is of men? and that if it is, it will, according to the opinion of Gamaliel,* "come to nought."

Gentlemen, "the Law-giver of the Christian Church foresaw all the various situations in which his people could be placed, and framed for them a constitution adapted to every state of society, to all countries, and to all ages. It is not to be supposed that his laws and ordinances would be so imperfect as to need change or addition in any subsequent period of his people's history. Such an idea is totally inconsistent with the views we ought to entertain of the legislative wisdom of the Saviour. The institutions of the gospel were not intended for any peculiar condition of civil and political society, nor were they limited to any country or to any time. They evince consummate knowledge of human nature, like the glorious doctrines which they so evidently set forth. They are suitable to man *as man,* in every age and every clime."

It may be said, that the Church of Christ is the Testator's Executrix, and has therefore no more power to alter the provisions of his Will, than an executor or executrix has to alter that of an earthly testator. No man, nor body of men, can depart from the tenor of either, without becoming personally responsible, either to the law of God or to that of man. The Testator says, "The Comforter,

* Acts v. 38.

which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you ALL THINGS, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you."* And John, in his General Epistle, says, "Let that therefore abide in you which ye have heard from the beginning. If that which ye have heard from the beginning shall remain in you, ye also shall continue in the Son and in the Father....These things have I written unto you concerning them that *seduce* you. But the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you; and ye need not that *any man teach you*, but as the same anointing *teacheth you of all things*, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it *hath taught you*, ye shall abide in him."† The main reason why the church in Thyatira brought itself under the reproof of God was, because it suffered that woman, Jezebel, which called herself a prophetess, to *teach* and to *seduce* his "servants to commit fornication, and to eat things sacrificed to idols."‡ The apostle Paul, also, on bidding the assembly at Miletus a final farewell, addressed the elders from the church at Ephesus, and through them the saints of the present day, saying, "I take you to record this day that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God."§ Surely, gentlemen, the passages I have just quoted will serve to show that the statements of my learned friend, that as regards institutions and ceremonies of order the Will proclaims its own insufficiency, and that it "was never designed to be a sufficient guide in all the details of management in the Church of Christ," cannot, without many and great qualifications, be received. Did he not himself show this when, in the most solemn manner, he subscribed to the sixth article of his church, which says, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation?"

And what says his brother clergyman, who was lately one of his coadjutors? "Nothing was to be left in future to custom and tradition, but a written standard, containing the pure word of God, was to be the test of every doctrine and every practice. This written word was to be considered as the public repository of revealed truth, open and accessible to all, that none might be left in a state

* John xiv. 26. † 1 John ii. 24. 26, 27. ‡ Rev. ii. 20.
§ See Acts xx. 17. 26, 27.

of uncertainty, or without a safe and sure guide in dark and heretical times."*

And now, gentlemen, what becomes of my learned friend's anticipation of your agreement with him, that "the common cry against many ceremonies of the church, Where do you find them in the Bible, is altogether unworthy of your enlarged and enlightened minds." Surely he cannot think you so ignorant as not to know that those ceremonies are additions to the Will, and that those who practise them, not only break the commandment of God, as contained in Deut. iv. 2, but subject themselves to the denunciation contained in Rev. xxii. 18. Indeed, it would appear, judging by the way in which my learned friend speaks of the Will, that he pays equal respect to the rules of his church as to the commandments of the Most High God, and would have you to do likewise.

Gentlemen, wherever two or three are gathered together in the name of Christ, there is a Church of Christ;† in other words, wherever the Head is, whether in the midst of few or many, there is a New Testament Church, all the members of which are on a level, every one of them, according to Rev. i. 6, being priests unto God; yet among them there are "little children," "young men," and "fathers," each having a variety of natural and acquired talents, the gifts and teachings of the Lord.‡ We read of a church in the house of Aquila and Priscilla;§ of one in the house of Nymphas;‖ and of one in the house of Philemon; and it is scriptural to conclude that in each of these churches the divine ordinances were observed. How, indeed, can that be denominated a church of Christ, where they are not attended to?¶

All assemblies of believers are scripturally authorised to select from among themselves such persons as they deem most suitable for pastors, for teachers, and for deacons. And these, being once appointed, ought to be looked upon as the more immediate servants of God, and treated with that love, deference, and courtesy which their high station demands. Nevertheless they are not to lord it over God's heritage, but to be ensamples for them to follow.** "Whosoever," said the Testator, "will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him

* Sermon on the Conduct of the Romish Church with regard to the Bible; by the Rev. David James, M.A., Minister of St. Mary's, Kirkdale, Liverpool.

† Matt. xviii. 20. ‡ 1 Cor. xii. § Rom. xvi. 3. ‖ Col. iv. 15.
¶ Acts xx. 7. ** 1 Peter v. 3.

be your servant."* "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them, and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so; but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve."† Every member of a church has an equal right to a voice in its government, yet every member must be subject to the general voice; and when any difference arises, it is for the minister and teachers to reconcile and conciliate, but not to control.

Now to baptize, to lay on hands, and to administer the supper, was not the peculiar province of the apostles. It seems they were simple brethren that baptized Cornelius and his friends;‡ that it was Philip, the deacon, that taught and baptized the eunuch, and the men and women of Samaria;§ that it was Ananias, a disciple, who was sent of the Lord to lay hands upon and to baptize Paul.‖ Nor is it anywhere said who among the community of saints was in the habit of breaking bread for the others; for what is said of Paul, in Acts xx. 11, must refer to his breaking bread for bodily sustenance, since it took place after midnight, which of course was the second day. But as we have the example of the Testator, who instituted the supper, and broke the bread for his apostles, it naturally follows that the individual whom any body of christians appoints over them ought to break the bread for them. It appears also, from Acts xiv. 23, and Titus i. 5, that churches were established, and worship carried on, before elders were ordained: this, it may be presumed, was the case at the time that all the church "were scattered abroad," except the apostles,¶ when, as we read, "a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord."** Equally does it appear that the Lord, in giving his commission to the apostles, promised to all believers the same gifts as he gave to them.†† This promise we see verified in Acts xi. 17. Wherever, therefore, the Bible may be found, and the people are able to read it, the Lord can, by his word alone, under the influence of the Spirit, form a people for himself, even in the most isolated region, where a preacher of the gospel may never have set his foot.‡‡ And in such case it would be in order for them to make a public profession, to baptize each other, and afterwards to form themselves into a church, placing over themselves those of their brethren, (for, according to the

* Matt. xx. 26, 27. † Luke xxii. 25, 26. ‡ Acts x. 23. 45. 48.
§ See Acts viii. 12. ‖ Acts ix. 10, 11. 17, 18. ¶ Acts viii. 1.
** Acts xi. 19. 21—26. †† Mark xvi. 17, 18. ‡‡ Jer. xxxi. 33, 34.

Epistles, more than one were ordained over each church,)* those who have the greatest gifts, or can most contribute to the edification of the others. Among an assembly of saints, all of whom the Testator makes kings and priests unto God,† some "lively stones" would undoubtedly be found, "to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."‡ It is true, there could be no ordination in this case; but if it is also true,—and, so far as we know, it is true,—that the *direct* line of ordination down from the apostles has for a very long time past been broken, never to be restored, it follows that none in the present day can scripturally pretend to such ordination. None can tell by whom the first minister of Christ in this country was ordained, nor whether by a genuine believer, nor even if he was ordained at all. As churches, therefore, were established in Great Britain, and gospel ministers placed over them, independent of regular ordination, so may churches spring up in like manner in any benighted country, where a church of Christ had previously never been heard of. What Paul writes to the Romans, x. 14, 15, applies much more to the people of that day, than to the world in its present state. Then the Old Testament only could be read; the New, not having been written, could only be learned from the lips of the immediate disciples of our Lord. Now, both the Old Testament and the New Testament are printed in many different languages and bound up together: so that all who have them may, if they will follow their instruction, be able to understand them.§ And this, according to the tenor of prophecy, when the Lord shall take to himself his great power,‖ shall actually be the case; for "they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord."¶ "And all flesh shall see the salvation of God."**

Thus you see, gentlemen, we do not, after the manner of some of our opponents, make any pretensions to an unbroken line of ordination from the apostles, or even from their immediate disciples. Nevertheless, we maintain that we are their descendants, after the same manner as we are the children of faithful Abraham.†† We believe that there has been one continued stream of christians, although unknown to any historian, from the days of the apostles

* See Acts xiv. 23; xv. 6; xvi. 4, 5.
† Rev. i. 5, 6.
‡ 1 Peter ii. 5.
§ Prov. ii. 1—5.
‖ Rev. xi. 17.
¶ Jer. xxxi. 33, 34.
** Luke iii. 6.
†† Gal. iii. 7—9.

until now;* but through what particular nations it has flowed, none can tell: and the stream shall continue to flow, and through darker ages, as it respects spiritual light, than it has hitherto flowed,† until the resurrection of the Witnesses; after which time, all the world shall be light.‡ David said, "A seed shall serve him, it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation."§ Thus the Most High does not count the generations of the world by the duration of the life of its inhabitants, but solely by the duration of the life of the saints;‖ the saints who were, and still are, the men whom he has created for his own glory¶—the men who "are the salt of the earth." If they were to perish, the earth would perish with them, as did the old world, when Noah was separated from it: he was the salt by whose savour only it was preserved, for the space of one hundred and twenty years.

My learned friend, as you have heard, informs us that "the institution of sponsors must be considered as an appointment of the church; not as an ordinance of God. That they are rather a pious and salutary custom of the church, than a necessary part of baptism; and that it is certain the institution of sponsors began very early in the christian church: that traces of it may be discovered in the writings of the fathers of the second, third, and fourth centuries." Now, gentlemen, after this admission, would not any one of common understanding suppose, that, after the manner of the Catholics, he takes tradition for his oracle, and the creed of the fathers for his doctrine, or why does he refer to them? And yet he denies this, by asserting, "We do not receive any customs because they have been long practised, but because they are scriptural, or *not* unscriptural:" and this in the teeth of the previous assertion, that we *ought to acquiesce* in such rules as are recommended by long practice. Well, gentlemen, plain people imagine there is no intermediate line between what is scriptural and what is not. My learned friend acknowledges that sponsors are not "an ordinance of God;" consequently, Paul did not preach them. And what says he to the people that do?** And what says the fourteenth article of his own church? "Voluntary works, besides, over and above God's commandments,... cannot be taught without arrogancy and impiety."

* 2 Kings viii. 19; 2 Chron. xxi. 7.
† Mark xiii. 24, 25.
‡ Rev. xi. 11. 15.
§ Psalm xxii. 30; see also Psalm cii. 28.
‖ Matt. i. 17; Luke iii. 23—38.
¶ Isa. xliii. 7.
** See Gal. i. 9.

My learned friend very justly deprecates the substitution of any thing opposed to the truth. "Oh!" exclaims he, "how hateful every antichristian delusion which practically denies that Christ has come in the flesh; and, supplanting our sympathising Saviour, would foist the blessed Virgin on the church, without a shadow of scripture authority, as a necessary mediatrix, and a tender mother, between us and the Judge."*

Here, gentlemen, I would ask, What more scriptural authority has my learned friend, even according to his own showing, to "foist on the church" the christening of infants, with all its attendant ceremonies; ceremonies quite as much at variance with "the truth" as that of looking to the Virgin Mary as a mediatrix. The teaching of the latter dogma is no more a rebellious act than the teaching of the former; while the teaching of either subjects the teachers to a threat as severe as that pronounced on Hananiah and on Shemaiah and their seed."†

Again, with respect to what he calls baptism, he says, that "it has become a cover for delusion, ... a charm to insure our salvation; that thus it is supposed that we are made christians by baptism. We have this in its full power in Popery. And there has been, also, in the Protestant Church, much of superstition in holding baptismal regeneration." Now, gentlemen, it has happened that my learned friend himself has subscribed to this superstition, this baptismal regeneration, and therefore justly comes under the sarcastic lash of the Bishop of Exeter, who is reported to have said, in the charge lately delivered to his clergy, that "He ... freely maintained the doctrine of the church, that in baptism we were regenerated, and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost. ... That any one, after having engaged that he would use the form of words, and continue to enforce them, could yet deny that regeneration was given in baptism, might appear incredible, did not the experience of the last two hundred years prove to the contrary. ... Persons there are, erroneously I hope, who take upon themselves to garble and omit expressions in administering this sacrament, which they are not too tender to promise to use."

Strange, indeed, it is, gentlemen, for a counsel to decry the purport of a sacrament, when he is not only hired to maintain it in all its bearings, but who has avowed more than once that *the* church

* The Promised Glory of the Church of Christ, page 204.

† Jer. xxviii. 15, 16, and xxix. 31, 32.

has authority to decree it. And stranger is it still, that he can "enforce what he disapproves, and disapprove what he consents to profit by." This can hardly be called "doing things decently and in order;" nor "being subject to the higher powers." But he misapplies the passage, Rom. xiii. 1—5. It is not those who have the government of what he calls *the* church, to whom Paul exhorts us to be subject, but to the government of the country in which we live. Subjection to the latter is imperative on every believer; but subjection to the former would be rebellion against God.

I cannot but regard the christening of infants, gentlemen, taking it in all its latitude, as "a cover for delusion." If you consult "The Ministration of Private Baptism," you will find that the first minister that can be found must *say* the Lord's Prayer, and so many of the collects ... as the time and present exigency will suffice, (*i. e.*, so many as can be said while there remains signs of life in the child.) Then the minister shall *pour* water upon it, saying, I baptize thee, &c., and afterwards return thanks that it hath pleased the Lord to regenerate this infant, and to receive him for his own child, and to incorporate him into his holy church: and this at a time when the infant is supposed to be, or is, on the threshhold of eternity. I think my learned friend will not deny, that all who teach false doctrines follow the example of Jeroboam, "who made Israel to sin;" but that he will rather agree with His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who is reported to have once said, in his place in the house of peers, that "every man must be aware that a contaminated religion was worse than no religion at all." Assuredly His Grace's remarks are in accordance with the following texts:—Isa. i. 11—15; Jer. iii. 6—8; xliv. 1—12; Ezek. ch. xvi.; xx. 39; Amos v. 21. 23; Gal. i. 6—9; Rev. xiv. 9, 10. And perhaps there never was a time when there was a greater number of contaminated religions, or, in other words, when the gospel was more contaminated by different sects, than at this present time. Consequently, it is now that "the devil is come down unto us, having great wrath, because he knoweth that he hath but a short time to live."*

Gentlemen, it is said, in Isa. ii. 8, "They (the house of Jacob) worship the work of their own hands, that which their own fingers have made." And there is a striking analogy between making and worshipping a graven image, and making a religion contrary to the gospel, and people deluding themselves in worshipping God

* Rev. xii. 12.

by it. But what said the Redeemer? "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."* O that men would consider the awful denunciation pronounced in Deut. xiii. 6 — 17, "If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers; namely, of the gods of the people which are round about you, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shall thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him; but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people," &c.† And the Lord is as "jealous for Jerusalem and for Zion" now as he was then.‡ And still will his judgments be visited alike on those who are seduced to worship, and on those who seduce them to worship, according to the doctrines which are "commanded of men."

What, gentlemen, but early prepossessions, supported by venerable names and habitual usage, could tempt our opponents to remain in error, especially that portion of them whose better judgment dictates the advantage of rising above it. "What is hoary with age, is of course venerable; what is emblazoned with pomp, and patronage, and distinction, is unhesitatingly to be received; what is transmitted from distant times, or comes sustained by the wisdom of our ancestors, is necessarily true. Thus men reason; or rather, thus men think." And thus, like Moab, they settle on their lees, and outwardly appear to be "at ease;" like him, therefore, their taste remains in them, and their "scent is not changed."§

"All scripture," gentlemen, "is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness;" and is "able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus."‖ And again, "the gospel of Christ" is "the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth."¶ The reigning sin of the world is, the perverting this gospel; and those who preach a perverted gospel are answerable for the loss of every soul whom they lead astray.** When a man of plain, common understanding, who has the scriptures in his hands,

* Matt. xv. 9. † See also Deut. xvii. 2—7. ‡ Zech. i. 14. § Jer. xlviii. 11.
‖ 2 Tim. iii. 16, 15. ¶ Rom. i. 16. ** See Ezek. xxxiv. 1—10.

and can read them, studies them as they counsel and direct, he will require little or no help from man.*

We differ in opinion from my learned friend, as to the *mode* of celebrating the Lord's Supper, and the times of joint religious worship, &c. We maintain that, in the scriptures, they are not left at large, and therefore we deny that they are to be determined by the people in every country respectively. As regards the observance of religious festivals, I shall refer him to what Paul says to the Galatians.† A church of Christ, gentlemen, as I have before stated, is a congregation of two, or three, or more believers, whether assembled in a building appropriated for the purpose of religious worship, or in "an upper room," or in a barn; no matter where they are, they constitute a church of Christ; while direction for the celebration of the supper was given by the Testator himself: "He sat down, and the twelve apostles with him;...and he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you, this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you."‡ According to Matthew, he says, "Take, eat, this is my body;...and drink ye all of it,...for this is my blood of the New Testament....And when they had sung a hymn, they went out."§ It does not appear that the participants changed their position until the supper was over. That they did not rise at the giving of thanks, I think is corroborated by Mark vi. 39. 41; "And he commanded them to make all sit down....And when he had taken the five loaves and the two fishes, he looked up to heaven, and blessed and brake the loaves," &c.

The Testator, so far as we know, gave no particular direction as to how often the supper was to be celebrated. His remarks are, "This do in remembrance of me." "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come." Neither do we know to a certainty how often the disciples, at the beginning of their ministry, celebrated it; but it appears that they celebrated it every time they met as a church to receive new converts. It is said, "they continued stedfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.... And the Lord added to the church *daily* such as should be saved."‖ We may scripturally presume, then, that at the time such were

* Isa. xxxv. 8. † Gal. iv. 9—11. ‡ Luke xxii. 14, 19, 20.
§ Matt. xxvi. 26—30. ‖ Acts ii. 42. 47.

added to the church, they partook of the supper, and thus were taken into fellowship, and reckoned among the members. That they celebrated it on every first day of the week, appears to admit of no doubt. We read in Acts xx. 7, "Upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them." From the manner in which the sacred writer expresses himself, it does not appear to have been a casual thing, but their usual practice. Hence it would appear, also, that the breaking of bread was on that day a primary part of their worship; and this text, as far as I can discover, is the first and only direct intimation of the first day of the week (called by the Revelator the Lord's day,) being the day of the Testator's resurrection,* having succeeded to the Jewish Sabbath.

"We have no positive command in the New Testament for observing the first day of the week as the Lord's day. Our authority for the change is solely in the fact or circumstance that the immediate disciples of our Lord observed it." Is it not then an inconsistency to observe the Lord's day without a specific command? And yet, because there is no specific command to celebrate the supper weekly, to decline so celebrating it, seeing that there is the same precedent for celebrating the supper every first day, as there is for observing every first day as the Lord's day. We may therefore regard the example of the Lord's immediate disciples, who by the Spirit of truth were guided into all truth,† as an authority, not only for keeping holy every first day of the week, but for the celebration of the supper every first day also, as binding as if the Testator himself had commanded it.

Seeing then that every first day is kept in commemoration of the resurrection of the Testator, and that the first day and the supper are so closely allied, as in Acts xx. 7, why should not his death, which is of equal moment with his resurrection, be commemorated every first day also? I do not see, indeed, how they can be scripturally separated. It is urged by some that so frequent a celebration of the ordinance would greatly detract from its solemnity; but the objection, if it be worth anything, would hold good in respect of the Lord's day also. Yet even admitting that there is force in the objection, it must always be remembered, that "to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."‡ Others, again, dread innovations, and say they ought to be avoided, because they are attended with danger. To this objection it may be urged

* John xx. 1. † John xvi. 13. ‡ 1 Sam. xv. 22.

that the present practice is an innovation, introduced into the church, nobody knows when, or where, or how, and that the continuance of it is attended with greater danger. A century before the seventy years' captivity, the man that might have counselled the people to let the land enjoy her Sabbath, according to the injunction in Lev. xxv. 4, would have been thought a wild innovator. But the dreadful consequence of the Israelites' abiding by the innovation is well known.* I have already pointed out to you, gentlemen, that no length of time can weaken, or vary, or annul the institutions of God; and I have given you three remarkable instances of the Jews, as a body, returning to the original observance of the ordained feasts, after neglecting them for hundreds of years; and I maintain that these examples prove that God has put such glory on his ordinances that the slightest infraction of them is regarded as rebellion against his sovereignty.

There is no scriptural precedent for celebrating the supper every first Lord's day in the month; therefore it is a traditional practice, preceded by a form which has no precedent in the scriptures, and which would be superseded by celebrating it after the apostolic example. Concerning the collection for the saints, Paul commanded every one in the Corinthian church, upon the first day of the week, to lay by him in store, that there should be no gathering when he came.† This, then, may be regarded as the authority for the custom of a monthly collection for the poor at the Lord's table. And if it be, it is equally scriptural to conclude that it was the constant custom of the apostles to break bread every first day also.

Partaking of the supper is an important and essential part of the worship of God; and every other part of his worship is alike important. He who, immediately before he suffered, said, "Do this in remembrance of me;" said also, immediately before his ascension to his heavenly Father, "Teach all nations, baptizing them. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." To which he added, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." So Paul says of the supper, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself."

In respect to my learned friend's remark, that the times of worship, &c., are left at large, I will refer him to the laws of his own church, which command that, in its communion service, "in cathedral and collegiate churches, where there are many priests and

* See Lev. xxvi. 15—43. † 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2.

deacons, they shall all receive the communion with the priest, every Sunday at the least." And which also implies that it shall be so received in all churches. I would also refer him to the evidence of his Fourth Witness, who says, "This ordinance seems to have been constantly administered every Lord's day."*

When our Lord said, "It is finished!" the whole of the Jewish ceremony, together with the Jewish sabbath, was virtually abolished; and from that time every thing relating to the worship of God was to be spiritual. "Behold," says Paul, "all things are become new."† And as the seventh day was kept holy in commemoration of the completion of the work of creation, so the Lord's day is kept holy to commemorate the completion of the greater work of redemption; as it is written in the Psalms, "Thou hast magnified thy word above all thy name;"‡ and as it is said by some one—

> "'T was great to speak the world from nought;
> But greater to redeem."

The change from the seventh day to the first was typified, at the time of the Exodus, by the month Abib, which had previously been reckoned the seventh month; but, to keep the children of Israel in remembrance of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage, it was changed to the first month, and their institutions were regulated accordingly.

Is there not more indicated, then, in the change from the seventh day to the first, than meets the eye of a cursory reader? Reckoning from the original first day of the week, the Lord's day would be the eighth day; and may typify, in its turn, the eight thousandth year, when we may "look for a new earth" where Christ shall reign with the saints in person. Then, if we may judge by analogy, as the finishing of the creation of the world was commemorated by a Sabbath of rest, so, reckoning "a thousand years as one day,"§ shall the finishing of its duration be commemorated in like manner. And as "the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound,"‖ so we may scripturally conclude that the commencement of the seven thousandth year will, according to Matt. xiii. 37—43, 47—51, be the end of the world there mentioned, when the wicked shall be gathered "out of his kingdom,"

* See his Commentary, on Acts xx. 7. † 2 Cor. v. 17.
‡ Psalm cxxxviii. 2. § 2 Peter iii. 8. ‖ Isa. xxx. 26.

severed from among the just, and "cast into the furnace of fire;" and that the seven thousandth year will be that happy era described by the prophet Isaiah, "when the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea. When he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth. When the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf, and the young lion, and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice' den."* And will not this be the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham, "Thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies."† At the conclusion of which period, the saints that are then alive "shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye;"‡ "for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we ever be with the Lord."§ Then will that great and terrible conflagration take place which is foretold by the apostle, 2 Peter iii. 12, 13; and then will commence that still more happy era, when the saints shall dwell upon the new earth, and live and reign with Christ a thousand years."‖

And may not this, gentlemen, be the antitype of what we read in Lev. xxiii. 35—43? Where it is said, to all that were "*Israelites born*," "On the first day there shall be a holy convocation....On the eighth day shall be an holy convocation unto you...it is a solemn assembly....Also...when ye have gathered in the fruit of the land, ye shall keep a feast unto the Lord seven days. On the first day shall be a Sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a Sabbath...and ye shall rejoice before the Lord your God seven days." The feast of tabernacles was kept seven days, in commemoration of the people dwelling in booths during their journey from Egypt to the land of promise; and the eighth day was the great "feast of ingathering."¶ So the seven days of the world, equal to seven thousand years, of

* Isa. ch. xi † Gen. xxii. 17. ‡ 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52.
§ 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17. ‖ Rev. xx. 4. 6. ¶ Exod. xxiii. 16. John vii. 37.

which the first day is now the Sabbath of the Lord, may typify the true Israel, the born of God, rejoicing while in a manner separated from the inhabitants of the earth, and journeying through this world on their way to the land of eternal rest. And the eighth day Sabbath, that of the great and final ingathering of all the saints, when the Lord shall present them "to himself a glorious church, without spot or wrinkle."*

Thus the Israelites, after having dwelt seven days in booths, in order to remind them of the length of time they had dwelt in tents, while wandering through the wilderness, and also of their deliverance from their painful journeyings, returned with rejoicing to their "goodly houses." So the christian, after a painful journey through this world's wilderness, has the certain assurance of being, at the final "ingathering," brought to his eternal home; whence he will always look back with gratitude to his Saviour, for having safely led him through all its dangers, unto the glorious "mansions" of his heavenly Father.

Gentlemen, as I have been informed, on good authority, that my learned friend's opinion on the personal reign of Christ has great influence with his fellow-clergymen, and of course with their respective hearers, I shall, for the information of the court, read a few extracts from a work of his, entitled "The Promised Glory of the Church of Christ," by the Rev. E. Bickersteth.

"The first resurrection is followed by the judgment of the saints, according to their works, and the assigning to them their reward.† ...The harmony and union of the millennial kingdom shall be broken by one more manifestation of the corruption of man, and the deceived nations shall come against those who remain faithful to God, *the camp of the saints, and the beloved city.* All the wicked shall finally then be judged, and for ever be separated from the righteous, and *the new heavens, and the new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness,* for which we are looking, will be perfected for ever.‡ ... There are, indeed, two resurrections, that are distinct in point of time, as we find intimated in various parts of scripture, and clearly and fully set before us in Rev. xx.; but the righteous only are personally and immediately interested in the first resurrection. There is the resurrection of the just, and of the unjust;§ the resurrection unto life, and the resurrection unto damnation.‖ We learn, in Rev. xx.

* Eph. v. 27. † Page 147. ‡ Page 148. § Acts xxiv. 15.
‖ John v. 29.

4 — 6, and 12 — 14, that there is a thousand years between these two resurrections.* ... Most startling will it be to the wicked left on earth. 'There shall be two in the field, one shall be taken, and the other left; two women shall be grinding at the mill, the one shall be taken and the other left; in that night there shall be two in one bed, one shall be taken and the other left.'† ...

"We have the gathering before him of all nations, the full and minute investigation of their works, and that final sentence which decides their eternal state. That this is a just view of this last description will be more apparent, if we consider the order in which it takes place. It follows the account of the visible separation of the faithful living at Christ's coming. It closes the whole statement of the judgment to come, and therefore naturally includes the judgment of the dead. Our Lord had stated that he would send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they would gather together his elect.‡ He had shown that the righteous would be separated from the wicked, and taken from a destruction coming upon them similar to that of the flood. ... The judgment of the wicked living at Christ's return is everywhere described as a destruction by war and by the sword of Christ, and not by a judicial assize, in which a strict account is taken of all of their actions; while the actual judgment-seat, at which men will be finally judged, is reserved for a subsequent period. Thus Isaiah predicts it.§ He again foretells the same event thus: 'Behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots, like a whirlwind, to render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh; and the slain of the Lord shall be many.'‖

"That we rightly apply such prophecies to the second coming of our Lord Jesus Christ from heaven, is clear from Rev. xix. 11—15, where St. John thus describes his return: 'And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True; and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew but he himself. And he was clothed in a vesture dipped in blood: and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were

* Page 166. † Page 170.

‡ Matt. xxiv. 31. See 1 Thess. iv. 16, 17; 1 Cor. xv. 52.

§ See Isa. xxx. 27, 32; Isa. xxxi. 5, 8, 9. ‖ Isa. lxvi. 15, 16.

in heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he might smite the nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; and he treadeth the wine-press of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God.' St. John proceeds after this to detail the awful judgments which will consume the wicked then living on the earth.

"But all individuals living on the earth are not gathered together at that time. In a passage which describes this judgment, we are told, 'the slain of the Lord shall be many.' We also read, 'I will send those that escape of them unto the nations, to Tarshish, Pul, and Lud, that draw the bow, to Tubal and Javan, to the isles afar off, that have not heard my fame, neither have seen my glory; and they shall declare my glory among the Gentiles.'* Thus, after the more openly rebellious have been destroyed, there is a remnant left, and nations that have seen this glorious interposition of God in behalf of his people."...From Rev. xx. 12. 15, "we may distinctly see that this account of judgment given by our Lord, is the account of the last judgment. But if so, how is it described as if the whole judgment took place apparently at one and the same time; and how is it consistent with the resurrection of the saints at the return of our Lord, their being judged, and their reigning with Christ a thousand years before the rest of the dead are raised and judged, as we read in Rev. xx.? The answer is simple and obvious. It is customary with the inspired writers to group unfulfilled and distant events together. We see this through all the prophecies of scripture. The events of the first and second advents, though nearly two thousand years were to intervene, are thus continually connected together.†...

"'*They that are Christ's* shall be made alive *at his coming*,' &c.‡ Every thing that opposes itself to Christ will be brought into complete subjection; all his enemies shall be confounded and wholly subdued. The same visible exercise of judgment is predicted in Rev. xix. and xx., and more especially in the binding of Satan for a thousand years. Who can tell the happy effects of such an entire removal, for such a season, of all the temptations of him who has so long been the god of this world, and led its millions captive at his will. ... Yet, notwithstanding all, we have, at the close of this reign,

* See Isa. lxvi. 15—19.

† Pages 177, 178, 179, 180, 182.

‡ See 1 Cor. xv. 24—28.

human wickedness bursting forth again, and thence the loosing of Satan again out of his prison for a short period, his deceiving the nations on the earth afresh, his war against the camp of the saints and the beloved city; and upon this he is put down for ever.*...

"'The nations of them which are saved, shall walk in the light of it; and the kings of the earth do bring their glory and honour into it.'† This, it may be allowed, is a mysterious part of our subject; but little known and thought of, but little considered and understood, by the church in this day. Yet it is not dimly revealed in the word of God. The common conception among christians has often been as if the redeeming love of God was exhausted in the company of the elect, who meet the Lord at his appearing, and are thenceforth ever with the Lord. But a deeper and closer search into the scriptures, reveals a further mystery of Divine goodness. The words of our text here clearly teach us, that there are nations on earth who walk in the light of the city, as distinct from the city itself; that there are kings over those nations, and that they bring their glory and honour to it. (We must distinguish between the state of the new Jerusalem, and the state of the nations which shall walk in the light thereof: they shall not be both one, but much differing.) This is a deeply mysterious, but unspeakably magnificent truth. Let us mark its harmony with other parts of divine truth.

"1st. Its consistency with the events of judgment.

"If the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked, and the general judgment of all men, took place at one time, and in the same day, none would, none could be left as the heads and parents of a redeemed people on earth. But the holy scriptures reveal to us a progress in judgment, and that the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked are clearly distinct in time. There is the first resurrection of the saints at the commencement of the millennium, and after the thousand years the rest of the dead live and are judged....When the saints have thus been translated to their glory, no believers are left upon the earth: 'darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people.' The great day of the Lord's wrath is upon all nations. It is the season of righteous judgment; the time of *the great tribulation, the third woe.* The solemn language of Isaiah thus describes the course of this judgment: 'Behold, the Lord will come with fire, and with his chariots like a whirlwind, to

* Pages 220, 221. † Rev. xxi. 4.

render his anger with fury, and his rebuke with flames of fire. For by fire and by his sword will the Lord plead with all flesh, and the slain of the Lord shall be many. The curse hath devoured the earth, and they that dwell therein are desolate; therefore the inhabitants of the earth are burned, and few men left.' The enmity of the wicked, after the resurrection and translation of the saints, seems to be chiefly directed against the part of the Jewish nation which, restored to their own land, trusts in the law of Moses, and has not received the true Messiah. This brings upon them those heavy judgments so often predicted in the word of God. The judgments fall first on the Jewish nation, and then on the apostate nations. The people of Israel behold the pierced Saviour, and repent; and many of the Gentiles 'remember and turn unto the Lord,' and are spared and preserved; and they thus delivered from the inhabitants of our earth, during the millennial kingdom, who are subject to Christ and his saints. Thus, in the midst of the 'judgments in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness,' and all shall finally yield avowed subjection to God. The subjection during the millennium not being, indeed, a complete and full subjection of the heart to him, the corruption of man will, at its close, have a yet further manifestation. During the millennium, the faithful are mingled with those who only yield a feigned obedience, as we see predicted in the close of the prophecies both of Isaiah (lxv. 20) and Zechariah (xiv. 17—19). The last rebellion, after the millennium, is distinctly described in the book of Revelation: 'When the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to battle.' The objects of their enmity are, the camp of the saints and the beloved city; and the extent of the rebellion affects the whole earth. 'And they went up on the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them.' The camp of the saints, therefore, and the beloved city are protected and delivered by the immediate interposition of God, just as before the millennium the Jewish nation in part, and many of the Gentiles, had been delivered. This last open apostacy of the wicked finally separates all the unbelievers, and removes them from the earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. They are first slain by fire, and afterwards raised with the rest of the wicked dead for Judgment.

But no change is then mentioned as passing on the Jewish nation, or on the living righteous, who continue faithful to God, as in the translation of the saints before the millennium. The object of the rebellion to overthrow the camp of the saints and the beloved city fails of its design. God protects them. The living righteous, then, after the millennium, may yet continue a seed to serve God, and in successive generations be trained up for heavenly glory.... The promises to the church scattered through the scriptures, of REIGNING HEREAFTER OVER THE EARTH, furnish another proof of the perpetual continuation of men living in the flesh on our earth."*

Again, my learned friend has also said elsewhere, "I wish to show you that the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ will *precede*, and usher in, that glorious state of blessedness on the earth (when the kingdom of this world will become the kingdom of God and his Christ).

"It will precede it; for, at the Lord's coming, the earth, instead of being in a millennial state of holiness and happiness and harmony, will be in a state resembling the wide-spread wickedness of the days of Noah and of Lot. This is precise and plain, as you learn from the seventeenth chapter of St. Luke...You have a further corroboration in the epistle to the Thessalonians.†...Now, if the world is to be as it was in the days of Noah, or as the cities of the plain in the days of Lot, in a state of ease, peace, and fancied security, until suddenly the Lord shall descend from heaven with the voice of an archangel, and the trump of God; then it appears that, instead of coming when the earth is filled with the knowledge of the Lord, namely, at the end of, or during that period of blessedness, he comes at the beginning, and while the earth with its inhabitants are in the condition in which you see them; for at this present time the world is as it was in the days of Noah, they eat, they drink, &c...So is it the essential characteristic of the world now, practically to despise as an idle tale the plainest sayings of the word of God respecting the coming and the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; they are saying, Peace and safety; promising themselves stability, and enjoying their idols. 'Their land is full of silver and gold, &c.; their land also is full of amusements, 'and the harp and the viol, the tabret and the pipe, and wine are in their feasts,' &c.‡

"The force of the argument, however, is lost upon some minds,

* Pages 238, 239, 240—242, 246. † 1 Thess. v. 2. ‡ Isa. ch. ii.

or, at least, weakened in some degree, by an idea collected from Rev. xx. 7; 'When the thousand years shall be expired,'—namely, the thousand years of blessedness previously described,—'Satan shall be loosed out of his prison,' &c.* The objection lies thus; here is a description of wickedness again, at the end of that period of blessedness, and therefore the world might *then* be, in consequence of that reviving wickedness, in a state similar to that of the times of Noah and of Lot, and then is the time of the coming of the Lord; so that, although Christ should not come till after the period of blessedness, yet still he might find the world in a state of wickedness when he does come. Now, in reply to this, I observe, First, that the passage does not describe such a state as that of the world in the days of Noah and Lot, a state of planting and building, marrying and giving in marriage; or, as it is described in the epistle to the Thessalonians, a state of fancied peace and safety, and carelessness about God; but, on the contrary, a state of conflict just commenced, which is instantaneously put an end to by the immediate power of God. Therefore there is no ground for the supposition that the world will then go back again to a condition of carelessness and ease, similar to its present state, or its state in the days of Noah and of Lot. Furthermore, suppose the passage did imply this; supposing it did afford foundation for saying that the world, subsequent to the millennium, would be in that condition; still the objection would not hold good against our argument, for I proceed to show you, not only that the world shall be in a wicked state at the coming of the Lord, but that it shall *continue* in such a state *till* the Lord come. The mystery of iniquity which worked in the apostle's time, and which has manifested itself still more since, is described, under its last form as the man of sin, as continuing to work till it is banished and destroyed by the brightness of the Lord's coming.† Consequently, there shall be no interval between the time of the apostle and the coming of our Lord during which the mystery of iniquity shall not be at work; and no millennium, therefore, between the creation of the world and the second coming of Christ. This agrees with the parable of the tares.‡ ... The children of the devil, the tares, and the children of God, the wheat, are both growing together *till* the harvest, and at the harvest the Lord appears with his angels, the reapers....

"Driven to the conviction that these passages of scripture,

* See to the ninth verse. † 2 Thess. ii. ‡ Matt. xiii. 24—30.

descriptive of the Lord's coming, must find their fulfilment at the commencement of the millennium, the mind prejudiced against the subject has recourse to another objection, and argues that the event, called in these passages the coming of the Lord, cannot mean his *personal* coming. It is impossible, continues the objector, to believe that our Lord himself will really stand literally upon his feet on the Mount of Olives, or reign over the Jewish nation literally in person in Jerusalem; and who can believe, that with our Lord Jesus Christ himself personally reigning upon the earth, wickedness, in any shape, should again break out? O no, it cannot be a personal coming; it must be some important movement of providence over the nations, in figurative language called his coming.

"Consider this objection. Let us for a moment grant the supposition that it is only a providential movement, and then I ask, Where is his personal coming revealed in all the Bible? Where is there a passage left that predicts his personal coming? And surely that cardinal point of christian truth, the coming of Jesus Christ in glory to judge the world, will not be denied altogether. Where, then, is it revealed?" *

I shall here beg to remark, gentlemen, that it is now a prevalent error with men, to imagine that there is only one millennial state. Thus they confound the passages which relate to Christ's virtual coming to punish and destroy the wicked, and to reign over their rising and converted offspring by the power of his gospel, commencing at the end of the six thousandth year, and continuing to the completion of the seven thousandth year, with his actual coming in person, after this earth shall be destroyed, to reign with his saints upon the new earth for a thousand years. The last period of duration is positively fixed; † the former, as I have before shown, can be fixed only by analogy.

Rev. xx. 7—10, is also a stumbling-block to many. They cannot conceive how there can be a rebellion, after the general resurrection. But why should this be thought a thing incredible with them? Do we not read of a rebellion previous to the creation of the world? Our Lord says, the devil "was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth." ‡ Peter says, "If God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into

* Sermons on the Second Advent of the Lord Jesus Christ, by the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, first edition, pages 9—18.

† Rev. xx. 6. ‡ John viii. 44.

chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment, &c."* And Jude says, "The angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day."† Now, seeing these things took place before the foundation of the world, why should not Satan, after he shall be "loosed a little season,"‡ make another attempt for the mastery, after the world is destroyed, and the wicked again raised. We know that "in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be."§ The wicked, therefore, will rise in the same spirit of rebellion in which they were when they died; and thus be ready to join their old leader in a last attack on the camp of the saints, and on the beloved city,—the antitype to the earthly Jerusalem.‖ This war cannot take place on this earth; for after the Lord shall take upon himself his great power, and shall reign by the power of the gospel, "for he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet,"¶ the wicked will cease from the earth.** Nor can it take place during the thousand years of his personal reign, because at that time there will be none but the saints living. What other period is there for it, then, but that mentioned in Rev. xx. 7—10, *i. e.*, after the general resurrection? Leaving the extracts from my learned friend's work for the consideration of the Court, I shall now proceed with my reply.

Gentlemen, the stated "times" of worship, according to the apostle Paul, are every "first day of the week." In addition to which, the Lord's people may meet any other day.†† And the "places" are left to their own option; "a room"‡‡ in each other's houses, as I have before shown, or a place built for the purpose.§§ In his sermon on the mount,‖‖ the Testator has left us an example of preaching and exhortation; in addition to which, we have one of Peter's manner of preaching,¶¶ and another of Stephen's,*** and another of Paul's.††† In Rom. xii. 1—10, Paul also directs that each member of a church is to take that part in the worship for which the gift of God has best fitted him; and then, in order to prevent confusion, he gives directions‡‡‡ how each is to exercise that peculiar

* 2 Peter ii. 4. † 6th verse. ‡ Rev. xx. 3.
§ Eccles. xi. 3. ‖ See Rev. xxi. 2—4. ¶ 1 Cor. xv. 25.
** Psalm cxix. 119; Jer. xxxi. 34; Heb. viii. 11. †† Acts ii. 46, 47.
‡‡ Acts i. 13, 14. §§ Matt. xiii. 54. ‖‖ Matt. chapters v. vi. and vii.
¶¶ Acts ii. 14—40; iii. 12—26. *** Acts vii. 2—53.
††† Acts xvii. 22—31; and Acts xx. 18—36. ‡‡‡ See 1 Cor. xiv. 1—33.

gift. After which, in his epistles to Timothy and to the Hebrews,* he gives additional directions; so that those who are familiar with the scriptures, and take them for their guide, are at no loss how to conduct their worship in the fear of God.

Gentlemen, I think I have already sufficiently shown that the rite of christening, with its attendant ceremonies, is a prostitution of the ordinance of baptism, as inculcated in the commission; I shall now endeavour to show that it is equally at variance with common sense.

If the reigning King, Lords, and Commons who devised and established the "Baptismal Service," had introduced a clause, making sponsors responsible, not for the well-being of the child's soul only, but for the well-being of its body also; so that if the parents, through any neglect or failure, were unable to feed, clothe, and educate the child, the sponsors should, in that case, at their own expense, be compelled to do all these things for it; it is easy to understand that few if any would undertake the office of sponsor. And yet, the very people who would refuse to come under a vow which they could perform, thoughtlessly rush forward, at the first bidding, and think it an honour to take vows upon themselves which they know they cannot, and which they seldom attempt to perform; while they know, or might know if they would, that God is not mocked with impunity. He will surely require their vow;† "For every *idle* word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment."‡

Were our opponents not so unwise and inconsiderate, the priests would quake at the voice of Him who saith unto the heads of Jacob, "Thus saith the Lord concerning the prophets that make my people to err, that bite with their teeth, and cry, Peace: and he that putteth not into their mouths, they even prepare war against him. Therefore night shall be unto you, that ye shall not have a vision; and it shall be dark unto you, that ye shall not divine; and the sun shall go down over the prophets, and the day shall be dark over them."§ While the people themselves would shudder at the bare idea of being asked to become god-father or god-mother, and thus to usurp the place of God; for none but He who sees the end from the beginning can declare that a child shall, as it grows up, "keep his holy will and commandments, and walk in the same all the days of

* See 1 Tim. ii. 1—8; Heb. x. 25.
† Deut. xxiii. 21.
‡ Matt. xii. 36.
§ Micah iii. 5, 6.

his life." Nor would they usurp the place of the Son of God, so as to become "surety" for, and stand in the place and stead of an infant, until that infant arrive at a fit age, and be willing to take his own sins upon himself, which, by the way, in thousands of cases he is never willing to do. No one of them, either man or woman, if they would give the impiety of the act one serious thought, would dare to venture on such a suretyship. And could any persons now standing in the horrible position of sponsors be induced seriously to reflect upon their awful responsibility, they would feel as if a sword were piercing through their souls. Nor could any parent, who, after the priest, is the chief moving cause of this perilous rite, meditate on it as being unauthorised by God, and not quail to find himself in the same situation as were the pharisees and lawyers mentioned by the evangelist, Luke vii. 30. How my learned friend, who has declared in this Court that the "Ministration of Baptism" "has become a cover for delusion, a charm to insure salvation," the parent of "much superstition,"—can, in the face of his own declaration, be so presumptuous as to administer a rite which is the ground-work of such impiety, it is for him to explain. He must have read 2 Thess. ii. 7—11, but may not have discovered the applicability of the prophecy to the present time. Ask a hundred Churchmen promiscuously, why they cling to the Establishment, and there shall not be one of them who can give a better reason for so doing, than that it has been long established, or that it is the religion of the state, or that of their forefathers, or that it is aristocratic, and therefore fashionable. Nor can one of a thousand be found, who is able to say, that, after deep searching and deliberate consideration of the scriptures, he is persuaded his system is in accordance with the instructions of the Testator and his apostles.

The Plaintiffs, gentlemen, as you have heard, cannot agree as to whether the ceremony is for the advantage of the child, or for the benefit of the parents. Some of them see no good in it, either for one or other; and some no evil, and therefore, to be on the safe side, they submit to it. Some, again, think all infants alike; others, that the state of the parent forms the state of the child: others, according to our learned friend, "who have not been able to see the *scriptural warrant* for it,... have yet judged it to be so valuable, as an institution even of the church, that christians should on that account adhere to it." Others, again, think the child is regenerated by christening; while others scoff at the very idea of it. Others, again,

regard the rite only as "a memorial of fundamental truths, and a remembrancer of important duties," and think that the value of these things even, entirely depends on whether the parties attending it rightly consider what they are at the time doing.

Again, says my learned friend, "Every baptized person virtually contracts the engagements which those stipulations contain." This saying, gentlemen, bears irrationality on the face of it. A child cannot be bound by any civil contract made in its name. The law of England accounts those only capable of entering into a contract, who are capable of understanding it. And this law, gentlemen, is by one of her clergy deemed "the echo of the law of God."* A babe, a few days after it is born, cannot therefore be made responsible for an incomparably higher matter than any which is involved in a legal or judicial process.

Again, gentlemen, there is a difference of opinion among our opponents respecting the quality of the water to be used in this rite. An ancient bishop (Latimer,) implied that the water of any foul ditch would wash away sin; while some of the bishops of our day think the waters of the river Jordan would do it more effectually. Clean water is certainly the most appropriate. But it is the extreme of superstition to imagine that the water of the river Jordan has any thing in it of a more cleansing nature than that of the river Thames; and he who supposes that there is any saving virtue in either of them, by so much detracts from the virtue of the blood of Christ.

The apostle Peter informs "the strangers scattered abroad," that they are redeemed with "the precious blood of Christ,"† while Bishop Latimer told the people, in his day, that "the conversion of the world was by rags, by things which are the most vile in the world." And yet this bishop is supposed by the greatest portion of our opponents to have been regularly descended from the apostles!

Again, when my learned friend perceives that numbers of children are in no respect renewed, he is of opinion that they did not receive baptism rightly; for on this, according to him, depends their receiving the Holy Spirit. Now, gentlemen, he should have informed us what we are to understand by the term rightly. The infant is passive in the matter. I suppose he must mean, as expressed by the Third Witness, "children to whom baptism is not rightly administered;" or, as by the Fourth, children to whom it is not "done intelligently and uprightly;" or that the sponsors, or those

* Ould. † 1 Peter i. 19.

who brought them, did not bring them by faith and prayer, but looked upon their christening as a ceremony. This I apprehend is the opinion of my learned friend also. While we hesitate not to say, that it is looked upon as a mere ceremony by nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand who observe it. And as to the christening being rightly done, it is not, in any instance; neither in that of the young Prince of Wales, who I hope will live to reign over a more enlightened people, and see the dawning of a brighter day; nor in that of the poorest child in the land; nor in any of the intermediate grades. The law of christening, according to the "Prayer-book," is positive,—to DIP the child, if it be healthy; if not, to POUR water upon it. In no case that I ever read of, in our day, is either one or the other attended to. It is contrary to reason, then, to expect a thing to be rightly received which is not rightly administered.

Neither my learned friend nor any of his Witnesses pretend to guarantee the safety of the christened children, unless they die in infancy; then, they boldly declare, "it is certain, by God's word," that they are "undoubtedly saved." This certainly implies that the unfortunates who die unchristened are undoubtedly lost, although my learned friend denies that it does, and asserts that his clients do not hold "that infants dying without baptism are undoubtedly damned," but that they leave them, without despair or distrust, in the hands of a merciful Saviour. This assertion, gentlemen, cannot be correct, because it is at variance with "The Order for the Burial of the Dead,"—an order to which he and most of his clients have subscribed, and which begins as follows:—"Here it is to be noted, that the office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands on themselves." Thus you perceive, gentlemen, we have the unchristened innocents, as far as *the* church is concerned, classed with and placed foremost in the list of the greatest sinners of her community, and, in company with them, consigned to perdition. According to her 9th Article, "every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation." And this accords also with what is contained in the edict of the Lateran Council, *i. e.*, that the exclusion of a heretic's corpse from burial is deemed "to involve the eternal damnation of the wretch unburied." And what says Tract 191, emanating from the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, in every parish of England, (which Society, it is reported, has the Archbishop of Can-

terbury for its president, and for its standing committee the Most Rev. the Archbishops, and the Rev. the Bishops, together with a selection from the inferior clergy, and thirteen laymen,) which bears the title of "Registration and Baptism," and purports to be an address from the Minister of the Parish to Christian Parents?

"I think it my duty to caution you against a strange notion, which sometimes prevails, that this registration of births does away with the necessity of *baptism*.

"Remember that all human beings are born in sin; and that a child, until it is baptized, remains in a heathen state; is not a member of the Church of Christ; has no part in the blessings purchased for us by him; is not a partaker of the privileges and hopes of the gospel, nor an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven.

"I earnestly, therefore, and affectionately exhort you, that you will not be guilty of such neglect toward your infant, as to deprive it of the inestimable blessings which are derived from admission into the Church of Christ by the sacrament of baptism; but that you will not delay to present it at the holy font for that purpose."

Now, gentlemen, without insisting that the motive for publishing this document was a sordid dread of "*the* Church" suffering in her temporalities, yet an acquaintance with the nature of her constitution would naturally lead to such a conclusion.

This Registration, gentlemen, will most likely do more to sap the foundation of this rite, especially among the poorer classes of the community, than its promoters could have anticipated; because it gives the unchristened a claim on the parish, which previously, independent of christening, they did not possess. Indeed, I have read that its effects are already visible. If our opponents are anxious to uphold the rite, for the benefit of the child's soul only, they should issue another tract, recommending the parish ministers, in every instance, to follow the example of the Rev. Mr. Langley, clergyman of St. Mary's, Wallingford, who, it is reported, in order to show his loyalty, had, on the 25th January, 1842, a public christening, *free of fees*, when fifty-six new members were admitted into the church.*

I will detain you but a moment, gentlemen, while I read from a newspaper I hold in my hand, the following remarks. "Ominous, indeed, must be the internal and external history of that church, that, in the nineteenth century, issues such a document as Tract 191.

* Churchman's Monthly Review, February, 1842.

"The usual and ordinary resources of producing an effect upon the public mind are almost in all cases exhausted before means of a desperate character are used. In the present case it would seem that the Established Church, naturally anxious to retain its hold, but finding that its grasp on the public mind is daily waxing weaker and weaker, now resorts to terror as a prop, and with desperate audacity publishes to the world, that all infants unbaptized are in a damnable state, but their salvation may be secured by presenting them at the 'holy font.' We were quite prepared to hear of semi-popery in the neighbourhood of Oxford, but that the whole of the Established Church should give indications of such heterodoxy has made us shudderingly exclaim, Where will it end?"*

Now, gentlemen, although it is plainly implied, that if a child lives to commit sin its christening is unavailable, or at best doubtful, yet in the "Order of Confirmation," which is closely allied to the rite, all of every age who choose it may, notwithstanding the sins they have committed in the intermediate period, on the day appointed, openly ratify and confirm, before the church, in their own persons, what their god-fathers and god-mothers promised for them, and "acknowledge themselves bound to believe and to do all that was undertaken for them!" Then the bishop prays for them, as being regenerated and pardoned, and lays his hands upon them, to certify them by that sign of the favour of God towards them.

Thus far the children have been guiltless of all the profanity that has been used over them; now, they become personally responsible for vows which they can no more fulfil than their sponsors could; and are led to believe that, however guilty they may have hitherto been, they have obtained remission for all their sins, and that by the trivial means of merely learning to answer questions out of a short catechism, and to repeat the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. Then, gentlemen, to complete the delusion, we have the "Burial Service," which consigns to the grave, with the three exceptions previously noted, every individual,—the innocent babe and the most hardened sinner, together with every intermediate shade of character,—"in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life."

Permit me to read to you, gentlemen, a short extract from the works of a late eminent clergyman: "I do not," he remarks, "prize our church catechism, it begins so very ill, calling baptism our new

* Liverpool Albion, January 4, 1842.

birth, and making us thereby members of Christ, children of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven. ... All carnal churchmen fancy they are new born, because baptized, and quote the catechism as a proof of it; and the carnal clergy preach accordingly, and quote the same authority. The acting of sponsors is now become a mere farce, and a gossipping business; and to promise for infants what they cannot engage for themselves, may suit a covenant of works, but not a covenant of grace."*

Taking the whole of this scheme for making christians into your serious consideration, gentlemen, Is there a question if anything more unscriptural or incongruous could have been devised by man? and I do not see how any christian, taking the word in its legitimate sense, can be, either directly or indirectly, a party to it, without engendering a suspicion of the sincerity of his profession. We pity the poor Indian, who immolates himself under the wheels of Juggernaut; but this act is an innocent one, compared with that of either christening or confirming either child or man; because one is done in ignorance of the laws of God, the other in defiance of them.† But, gentlemen, did not all the errors with which the Prayer Book abounds originate in what my learned friend denominates "the details of management"?

And here, gentlemen, allow me to remark, that one doctrine of the Roman Catholics is, that, according to the scriptures, there can be only "one church." This doctrine is undeniable; but, unfortunately for them, it is proved, by other doctrines which they hold, that theirs is not that church. Yet, while they maintain to the utmost that there is no salvation beyond their pale, they except my clients, by asking, "Do they (the truths which you profess) afford you a sure footing, to support you against all doubts and fears on the score of your religion, especially under the apprehension of approaching dissolution? If you answer affirmatively, I have nothing more to say; but if you cannot so answer, follow the example of those who have arrived at the port. Listen to the advice of the holy patriarch, Job v. 11."‡

It is quite true, gentlemen, as my learned friend remarks, that the dissentients from the established church are our bitterest enemies; and I cannot but think that their being so may be attributed

* Rev. John Berridge, A. M., late fellow of Clare Hall, Cambridge, and Vicar of Everton.

† See Luke xii. 47, 48.

‡ Milner.

to want of confidence in the position they have chosen. The late John Newton, in answer to a question put to him by a clergyman who had left the establishment and joined the Independents, replied, "You may have done right leaving us, but you have not gone far enough from our border." That both parties are put into a feverish state, when they meet with any truth repugnant to their adopted sentiments, both my learned friend and his Witnesses have manifested. How, indeed, can it be otherwise, when, to suit their prejudices, they hesitate not to wrest the scriptures from their plain and obvious meaning?

As my learned friend has intimated that the doctrines of the church cannot be made to correspond with the Will without the assistance of tradition, I shall read you a few remarks upon the subject.

"The word of God is divine — the fathers, at best, are fallible men. The word of God is consistent and harmonious — the fathers abound in contradictions. The word of God, on all the plain matters of salvation, is plain and simple in its style — the writings of the fathers clouded with mists of rhetoric, or the fumes of vehement controversy and debate. The word of God is within the reach of every christian — the fathers inaccessible to all but a few rich and learned men. The difficulties which are to be met with in the direct study of the scriptures, meet with tenfold aggravation in the patristic writings. Have christians in general to gain their knowledge of scripture through translations? It is the same with the knowledge of the fathers; but the translations are far less trustworthy. Have doubts been raised by infidels, and adopted by jesuits, against the integrity of our canon and the genuineness of the sacred writings? The proof of the authenticity of the fathers is far more difficult. Is private judgment to be distrusted in the exposition of scripture? Surely it is far more unsafe, when the field is a hundred-fold wider, when the materials are uncertain and conflicting, the separate authorities fallible and often deceived, and the current of truth from the very first, as the apostle teaches, mingled with a growing mystery of corruption. No fallacy or folly seems greater, however shielded by some respectable names, than that of distrusting private judgment in the interpretation of scripture, and relying on it for a right understanding of the Fathers."*

As for the wisdom and humility of which my learned friend

* Churchman's Monthly Review, November, 1841.

speaks, I think the latter may be compared to the humility which some think they manifest when they pray to the Virgin Mary, and thus by their tradition make God's written word of none effect.

My learned friend, as you have observed, gentlemen, is much enraged that the Roman Catholic Church, to which he is so nearly allied, should practise the christening of bells, and horses, and asses, and indeed every thing which is calculated to degrade the rite. But let me ask, Is the christening of bells, and horses, and asses, in Catholic Rome, a greater degradation of the rite than christening ships in Protestant England? Or is the act of a Catholic bishop, when he christens bells, &c., more incongruous than that of a Protestant bishop, when he consecrates regimental colours, and, in his address to the soldiers, tells them that "there is not a truer man of peace than a christian (christened) soldier." Nor is prayer for the dead, of which within the last few years we have heard so much, a whit more unscriptural than the tolling of the passing-bell, or the desecrating of the Bible by parading it for party purposes on a coach-box. And if bells make a part of the consecrated church, is it not a degradation of the edifice to ring them on the success of a horse-race? Why then should my learned friend be so angry with the mother church for christening bells, and horses, and asses, &c., things which the Will has left "wholly unnoticed," while, according to his own showing, she "has delegated authority" to decree those ceremonies, and to command obedience to them?

And what says the 20th Article, to which my learned friend alludes? "It is not lawful for the church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word written." Well, then, gentlemen, it is contrary, to God's word to add to or to take from it. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you."*

Now, gentlemen, I maintain that the suppression of the baptism which was commanded by the Testator, and which was practised by his apostles, is a taking away from the word; and that the christening of a child, the appointment of sponsors, and the making a cross upon its forehead, are as much and as many additions to the word, as is the christening of bells, and horses, and asses. Therefore, as my learned friend declares, "there has been in the Protestant Church much of superstition;" and that, "through the corruption

* Deut. iv. 2. See also Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

of man,...baptism (as practised in it,) has become a cover for delusion, and, like that of popery, led to all sorts of follies, and to everything calculated to degrade baptism, and make it absurd and ridiculous." Nay, he has even been constrained to declare, that "the consequent inconsistency of the baptized has reacted in evil, weakening the faith of *the* church in baptismal blessings, till we (the Episcopalians,) are brought to that awful state of mere nominal christianity which now palsies the whole professing church, and makes our beautiful baptismal service a dead letter, and a grand stumbling-block to our opponents."

Gentlemen, the christening of bells, and horses, and asses does them no harm; while the christening of infants, if they live and build upon it, may tend to their eternal destruction.

I see not, gentlemen, why my learned friend should feel so much hurt at the rite being degraded, when he himself acknowledges that it is taken "rather from inference than from positive appointment, and implies that it is an institution of his 'church,'" and that sponsors are not appointed by the Testator, but by that same church. And if, according to his own acknowledgment, we are warranted to pronounce the whole institution to be the work of man, how much more does he himself degrade the holy, significant, and comprehensive ordinance of the Testator, by substituting for it such an unmeaning, irrational, and human rite as infant christening? He himself, in one part of his speech, condemns the "administration" of it, and declares that the major part of the christened grow up in sin; and yet, with a marvellous inconsistency, he not only advocates the confirmation of these sinners, as regenerate, but buries them "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life." The whole practice, gentlemen, I have shown to be at variance with the scriptures; and being at variance with them, it is clear that whatever "energy may accompany the baptismal services," by "the ministers, the people, the parents, and the sponsors;" or, whatever his friend Mr. Budd may say to the contrary, infant baptism will never be the instrument of christianizing the world.*

To a scripturally enlightened mind, gentlemen, the institution and its attendant ceremonies will appear as much the device of man, and to possess as much of Romish doctrine, as the idea of an intermediate place of punishment, &c. Hear what is said by Joseph Berington, to the Catholics of the United Kingdom. "The doctrine

* See Jer. xxiii. 25—40; Matt. xv. 9.

of *Purgatory*, and of the *Invocation of Saints*, stands on the same foundation as that of the authority of the church, though in support of the former the evidence of scripture is comparatively weak. Why, or how, this has happened, let him say 'who hath known the mind of the Lord, and hath been his counsellor.'"*

My learned friend brings forward a number of passages of scripture, which, according to his views of them, prove that the infants of believers are beloved for their fathers' sake; not considering, or not being aware, that most of these passages have reference to the Jews as a body, who are beloved for their father Abraham's sake; while that body is typical of every individual believer, who in the true sense of the word is beloved, not as being directly descended from him, but as being his seed through believing the promises of God, as Abraham did. I think we cannot have a clearer exhibition of the nature of God's dealings with the children of men than is furnished in Exod. xx. 5, 6, where he declares himself a "jealous God, visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children, to the third and fourth generation of them that (continue to) hate him; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that (continue to) love him, and keep his commandments."†

But my learned friend has discovered, as I have before observed, that the term nation includes infants; from which he infers that they are included in the Testator's commission. Well, we cannot deny the former; but we can and do deny the latter, and upon plain common sense principles too. He first distorts the commission, and then, like some of his Witnesses, he reads the promise backward, and acts according as he reads it. He admonishes us to obey the Lord of heaven and earth. This we endeavour to do; and it is on this account solely that we stand here. We teach the commission as the Testator intended it to be taught; and we direct the ignorant to search the Will for themselves; to look to the Lord by prayer, that he would open their hearts to receive his instruction, and that he would, by his Holy Spirit, show them their salvation. We assure them that when they believe,‡ they will be self-convinced of the fact, and know for themselves that compliance with the Testator's commission is the only way of entrance into his church.

Gentlemen, if, as my learned friend says, the passage, Acts viii. 37, be an interpolation, it is strange that he himself should not only

* Rom. xi. 34. † See also Ezek. ch. xviii. ‡ 1 John v. 10.

act upon it, but go far beyond it. He not only requires what Philip required, but much more. Philip, so far as we read, required of the eunuch only a simple acknowledgment of faith; (though the eunuch doubtless made the same confession as other converts had made before him;) but he, before he administers the rite, requires of the sponsors belief in "the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, and everlasting life after death;" together with the renunciation of "the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh." And it is yet more strange, that in the same address in which he asserts the passage to be an interpolation, he still shows "the necessity of faith previous to baptism."

But admitting the passage to be an interpolation, (which we do not, though it may be omitted in some manuscripts,) the necessity of faith before baptism would still be positive, not, as my learned friend would have you imagine, inferential; because faith, in Mark xvi. 16, precedes baptism, and both are inseparably united; "he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." Now can there be a more positive requirement, or can any form of words express in a clearer manner that none can scripturally look for salvation but those who are baptized on a genuine confession of faith? My learned friend himself must subscribe to this; and to this, and this alone, must be ascribed the institution of sponsors.

"In the service for infants," says the Rev. Capel Molyneux, B.A.,* "we find the same (as in the service for adults,) profession of faith and promise of obedience required from sponsors in their behalf; not a profession of the faith of the sponsors themselves merely, but of the sponsors in the name and behalf of the child. The sponsors must present the infant as a believer, and promise on its part that it will act and appear as such, when capable of so doing, and of a practical manifestation of its principle, and exhibition of its profession. Now it is on this profession and promise, personally made in one case, and sponsorially made in the other, and on this alone, that the church consents to baptize."

If my learned friend will read the whole of the 8th chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, he will find another passage which proves the requirement of faith before baptism. "When they believed Philip,

* See his work, "Baptismal Regeneration opposed both by the Word of God and the Standards of the Church of England," page 24.

preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women."* He will also find another passage to the same effect in Acts xviii. 8.

Can my learned friend imagine that the church, which he says sank into idolatry in former ages, differed very widely in the eyes of God from that which he calls the church of the present day? or that there will not come a time when a rod will be lifted against it? What said his own Second Witness? Why, that "men are most forward to that service of God which is of man's finding out and setting up,...and likes any way of worshipping God which is of his own framing, more than that which is of God's appointing."

My learned friend is of opinion that it was the design of the All-wise not explicitly to command the "baptism of infants," and thinks that if he had, it would have been more extensively abused. But, gentlemen, he has not informed us upon what texts of scripture his opinions are based; while it is the want of an explicit command which causes such disunion among its advocates, none of whom are able to determine which, or even if any, of the infants are in any manner benefited by the observance. He asserts, indeed, that the "omissions of scripture are full of instruction;" but this is in contradiction to Moses, who asserts, "The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law."† "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."‡

And if, as he says, the omissions of scripture are full of instruction, it follows, according to the same rule, that we should have had a sufficiency of instruction in the absence of any revelation at all!

It is curious to remark, gentlemen, what a change has come over the spirit of the times, when a clergyman, a man of note among our opponents, thinks that we are entitled, for our consistent piety and real devotedness, to "his brotherly esteem and cordial affection," we who have hitherto been classed among the vilest of the vile, and are still regarded as those who "turn the world upside down." Yet we accept, with all good feeling, his courtesy, and regret that we cannot, on gospel principles, reciprocate it, by acknowledging any relationship. Perhaps my learned friend has been studying Whiston, and found the remark of Sir Isaac Newton, that "the Baptists are the only people that have not symbolized with the Church of Rome."

* Verse 12. † Deut. xxix. 29. ‡ Isa. viii. 20.

My learned friend asserts that we imagine, that by supporting an ordinance "differing from so large a portion" of what he denominates the christian world, we are giving a proof of our devotedness to Christ. Well, we do not deny that his assertion is correct, although he may think that by so doing "we are running counter to his gracious institution." John the Baptist, the Testator, and his disciples, each and all ran counter to the religious world; and for this they were persecuted and slain. Yet the institution remains, and will remain, when "infant sprinkling" shall be no longer remembered, except as a matter of history.*

"When opinions," says my learned friend, "founded on current and acknowledged interpretation of the scripture, have been received without doubt or dispute, from the earliest times of christianity to a comparatively late age, the prejudices in their favour, and against the innovations which have been made upon them in latter days, are fair and legitimate. There seems, indeed, to be some presumption in setting up our private opinions and interpretations against the unanimous testimony of the early christians; and it is evidently dangerous. For if we will not admit their unvarying and uncontradicted testimony, in proof of an apostolical and scriptural doctrine, I know not how we shall convince an unbeliever that they are sufficient witnesses of the authenticity of sacred writ, or of the authority of its canon."

Here, gentlemen, we have an illustration of the force of prejudice, and the power of early habits. Rather than differ from the world, by giving up opinions derived from tradition, men will risk their present and eternal happiness; although the apostle James informs us that "the friendship of the world is enmity with God. Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world, is the enemy of God."† My learned friend seems to imagine that there is no presumption, no danger, in preferring the tradition of those whom he denominates the early christians, to the clear and explicit commands and ordinances of the scripture, as dictated by the Spirit of God, nor to see the vanity of allowing our minds to be warped by their opinions and practices, when we have the same inspired record for our instruction as they had, with incomparably easier access to it, and the same promise of the Holy Ghost to guide us "into all truth."‡ The early christians of whom he speaks are not those who were immediately converted by the Testator and his disciples, who alone are

* Eccl. xii. 14; Luke xvi. 17. † James iv. 4. ‡ John xvi. 13.

entitled to the appellation. But, gentlemen, who are the people that have received, without doubt or dispute, these traditionary interpretations? Why, the Plaintiffs and their progenitors. But is this any argument why we are to receive them? No. These are some of the things which we withstand, and for which we were brought here; and your verdict will show, that by putting them in the balances we have proved them wanting.* Thus we shall not only successfully withstand, but we shall triumph over, them. If an unbeliever cannot be convinced of the truth of the Bible by the writings of the prophets, who prophesied at various times, many hundreds of years apart, and yet all came to the same conclusion respecting the coming and reign of Christ; by the harmony which pervades all its parts, and by its living witnesses, the Jews; it is impossible to convince him of it by the opinions of the ancients.† From them we can gather no more of the truth than you, gentlemen, have gathered from the evidence that has been submitted to you by our opponents.

But my learned friend has said, on another occasion, "The traditional spirit, so far as it prevails, is a cover of unbelief, under the affected mask of diffidence and humility. If we cannot obtain truth from scripture, if that is an insufficient authority for us, it will necessarily lead to universal scepticism."‡

It is not possible, gentlemen, that infants, whom my learned friend admits are free from actual sin, can be looked upon by the Creator in the same light as penitents and believers. It is evident from the Will, that remission of sin and genuine baptism are inseparable, and that the former is consequent on the latter. "Repent," says Peter, "and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins."§ See also Paul's baptism, Acts xxii. 16. But an infant has no sin to be remitted, and cannot, therefore, stand in the same state as Paul did. And if the articles and liturgy of the church unequivocally state that every baptized infant, without exception, is born again, my learned friend has shown that they assert that which is not true; for he bears witness that "really saving grace is not received by *every* baptized person; and that the greatest portion of the *baptized* grow up in sin." According to his own statement, then, grace is not imparted to the greatest portion; and he will therefore find it impossible to prove that it is imparted to any portion.

* Dan. v. 27. † See Luke xvi. 31.

‡ The Promised Glory of the Church of Christ, page 251. § Acts ii. 38.

"There is nothing," says my learned friend, "in the apostle's words, which can allow us to separate regeneration from baptism, or to affirm of any *living* disciple of Christ, that he has been *born again*, *born of God*, or *born of the Spirit*, previously to this sacrament."* Now, if my learned friend means to imply, which I presume from the tenor of his address he does, that regeneration and baptism are one and the same thing, he is in error, as that would make the symbol the substance. We are of those to whom he alludes, who think that the necessary connexion between baptism and regeneration, which results from "the baptismal services of the Church of England," is not only untenable on principles of reason, but on principles of scripture also. "The notion of the water 'conveying the Spirit' is (says the Rev. G. Bugg, B.A.) THE FOUNDATION OF POPERY. *Popery* is literally *built* on this very doctrine. Make water baptism the '*fountain of life*,' and give the key of that fountain to the *priest*, and you have at once transferred *salvation* from Christ to the *priest*, and from the administration of the *Almighty* to the *church*, which ought to be 'subject to Christ.'"† Now, gentlemen, I will ask a plain question or two: On what is Protestantism built? And is not the declaration of Mr. Bugg also applicable to the "baptismal offices," (particularly that of private baptism,) of which my learned friend is the maintainer? I leave those who practise them to answer these questions.

The remainder of my learned friend's sentence I believe to be scriptural. It is evident that no individual is in a fit state to be baptized until he believes "to the saving of the soul."‡ Still, unless he follow his Lord's example, by being baptized, this belief gives him no scriptural ground to expect the blessings of the kingdom, since there can be no visible and public manifestation that he is born of God, until he has professed a good profession before many witnesses.§ And this was the opinion of my learned friend, when, in a previous part of his speech, he cited the following quotation from Basil: "Faith and baptism are the two means of salvation, adhering together and inseparable. Faith is made perfect by baptism, baptism is dependent on faith. Each has respect to the same names: for as we believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, so we are baptized in the name of the Father, &c. Indeed,

* Baptism.

† Key to Modern Controversy, page 56.

‡ Heb. x. 39.

§ 1 Tim. vi. 12. See also Matt. x. 32, 33; Mark xvi. 16; Rom. x. 9, 10; 1 John iv. 3, 4.

confession goes before, leading to salvation; but baptism follows, *sealing* our confession and covenant."

Baptism in water, gentlemen, is a most holy ordinance, having been appointed of God for every believer; and thus it is connected with our regeneration, as denoting our change of "state" and "station;" the time when we give up ourselves to him, when we are figuratively "buried with Christ, and risen with him to walk in newness of life;" the time when we are "justified or freed from sin."* It is also the ordinance by which we are introduced into the church, and which manifests our relationship to our heavenly Father. By virtue of this relationship we establish our claim to the heavenly inheritance, which is conveyed to us through faith, that faith which is the unspeakable "gift of God."† As I have before remarked, however much an individual may be influenced and drawn by the Spirit, and have his eyes opened to see that there is salvation for him, still, this is not being born of, or baptized with, the Spirit, according to "the promise of the Father."‡ For until, in the ordinance of baptism, he has confessed his sins, and professed his faith in the Saviour of the world, those invaluable blessings are not sealed and secured to him; because, not having been baptized with water, he cannot look for the baptism of the Spirit, nor expect to be hereafter presented by, and to, Christ, as a member of his glorious church. This, I think, is clear, from the following passages; "They were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." "I indeed baptize with water unto repentance."§ "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven."‖ "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God."¶ "He that believeth, *and* is baptized, *shall be saved*; but he that believeth not shall be damned."** "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; *and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*"†† "And the Lord added to the church daily *such as should be saved.*"‡‡ Now, allow me to remark, that we never read of more than one presentation.§§ I see not, therefore, how our Lord could present to himself, under any circumstances, according to the scriptures, such individuals as had never followed him in

* Rom. vi. 4. 7.
† Eph. ii. 8.
‡ Luke xxiv. 49.
§ Matt. iii. 6. 11.
‖ Matt. x. 32.
¶ 1 John iv. 3.
** Mark xvi. 16.
†† Acts ii. 38.
‡‡ Acts ii. 47.
§§ Eph. v. 27.

the way of his appointment,* and more especially "without spot or wrinkle," seeing they had never confessed him "whose blood cleanseth from all sin,"† nor been baptized with, or born of, the Spirit, that Spirit who guides his followers into all truth, and shows them "things to come."‡

But some may ask, How, then, are they to be saved who may be called in foreign lands, where there is no one to baptize them; or those on a sick bed, or those whom their fellow men refuse to baptize? To this enquiry I have already replied, and now leave the enquirers to answer the question themselves. Does not the Lord give them the challenge? "Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth? saith the Lord. Shall I cause to bring forth, and shut the womb? saith thy God."§ "Is any thing too hard for the Lord?"‖ for "Him who worketh all things after the counsel of his own will?"¶ for him who "is in one mind, and who can turn him; and what his soul desireth, even that he doeth."** Strange indeed would it be, if the Lord gave his people a law, and yet should withhold from them the means of fulfilling it. His justice forbids such a course as this, and his love furnishes the means of their obedience.

It is clear that the Testator, after he rose from the grave, though he foresaw all contingencies, made no exceptions to his general "way of salvation;" but he has made known to us, by his Holy Spirit, that he which has begun a good work in any individual, will perform (or finish) it until the day of Jesus Christ.†† According to this promise, therefore, no individual in whom the good work is begun, can die until the Father of mercies complete it. "The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times."‡‡ God is not a man that he should lie, neither the son of man that he should repent; hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good?"§§

Gentlemen, there can be no manifest spiritual birth, previous to our entering the kingdom,‖‖ as there can be no natural birth, previous to our entering the world; and no unbaptized person can be reckoned a subject of the heavenly King, even as an unborn child cannot be reckoned the subject of an earthly one. The formation,

* See Matt. xix. 28.
† 1 John i. 7.
‡ John xvi. 13.
§ Isa. lxvi. 9.
‖ See Gen. xviii. 14.
¶ Eph. i. 11.
** Job xxiii. 13.
†† Phil. i. 6.
‡‡ Psalm. xii. 6.
§§ Num. xxiii. 19.
‖‖ See Psalm lxxxvii. 4, 5.

growth, and the beginning of life in the fœtus, are independent of the birth; yet, without the birth it cannot be brought into the world. So the formation, the growth, and the beginning of life in the convert, is independent of baptism; yet, without baptism the convert cannot be brought into "the kingdom of heaven," nor receive life "more abundantly."

When two individuals, whose minds are congenial, engage themselves to each other, they are virtually married; still, let their confidence in each other be never so great, they cannot be recognised as man and wife until they are actually married, neither can they lawfully live together. The mere ceremony neither increases their confidence, nor adds to their love; nevertheless, it is by the ceremony alone that their state is changed, and that they, between whom there was previously no consanguinity, are brought into the nearest relationship. And it is by virtue of the ceremony, also, that they enter into the full enjoyment of each other's company, which enjoyment increases, as the good qualities of each develop themselves. So the union of Christ and his church is figuratively represented by marriage;* which marriage does not, and cannot take place before, but at the time, the chosen and faithful, in the ordinance of baptism, give their ownselves to the Lord.† And it is by this baptism that they, being previously prepared, "through the faith of the operation of God," become united to their Lord, and are acknowledged the bride, the Lamb's wife.‡ Thus, being married to him, he takes upon himself all the debts and obligations which they were previously under to the law,§ and for ever sets them free from all its demands, in order that they should "serve him in newness of spirit."‖ Nevertheless, their baptism does not increase their confidence in his promises, but it brings them into a new station, elevates their state, and thus inducts them into the enjoyments of the married wife: which enjoyments increase, as the Lamb, by his good Spirit, develops his love more abundantly towards them, and thus causes their desire towards him to grow stronger and stronger.¶

Again; Paul says to the Corinthians, "I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ."** Now this espousal must take place before the presentation, and cannot be effected independent of some ordinance? And there is no

* Psalm xlv. 9—15; Rom. vii. 4.
† 2 Cor. viii. 5.
‡ See Rev. xxi. 9.
§ Rom. x. 4.
‖ Rom. vii 6.
¶ Song i. 4.
** 2 Cor. xi. 2.

visible outward ordinance, or act ordained of God, for that purpose, except that of scriptural baptism in water.

The psalmist asks, "Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle? who shall dwell in thy holy hill? He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness?* Then comes the question, Can an unbaptized individual, according to our Lord's declaration,† work righteousness? I think, in the true and scriptural sense of the word, he cannot: because it is the privilege only of those who are scripturally inducted into the Church of God to be "arrayed in fine linen, clean and white; for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints."‡

Gentlemen, the tree must be made good, or its fruit cannot be good;§ as is literally the case with many trees in this country. They do not bear good fruit until they are grafted. So a believer even cannot bring forth good fruit until by baptism he is grafted into the good olive-tree.‖ The fruit of the unbaptized professor may have the outward appearance of being, and in his own mouth may be, sweet as honey; but to his belly it must be "bitter;"¶ because he finds no spiritual nourishment in it. Indeed, according to 1 Cor. xiii. 1—4, there can be none: for what is charity, or love, but the keeping of the commandments of God?**

How then can it be asserted, and especially in the face of the commission, that there is salvation without baptism? To me it has ever appeared that there is not; but yet, men older in the truth than myself have argued that the thief on the cross was an exception to this rule; this deterred me on a former occasion from asserting that opinion, yet subsequent further and closer study of the scriptures now emboldens me to assert it, fearless of the assertion being scripturally overturned. The thief died before the completion of the old dispensation, and therefore before the establishment of the new;†† and I cannot see upon what principle it can be presumed that the Testator, who was about to furnish a general and positive rule for his people to follow, should immediately before have furnished them with an exception to that rule. Neither could baptism have been a seal which the believer sets to his confession of the death and resurrection of his Redeemer, previous to those events having taken place; nor can the positive command, proclaimed by the commission, be overruled.

* Psalm. xv. 1, 2.
† Matt. iii. 15.
‡ Rev. xix. 8.
§ Matt. xii. 33. Rom. xi. 24.
¶ Rev. x. 10.
** 1 John v. 3.
†† See Heb. xi. 13. 39.

If we admit the exception, we must also admit that after times have discovered that the Testator has given his people a law which is optional; a law which is not adapted to every circumstance, to every clime, and to every age. Nay, that he has given them "another gospel, which is not another."* But, gentlemen, "there can no more be two gospels, than there can be two suns in the firmament, or two Gods. The gospel of Christ is one unalterable, indivisible thing, bearing the 'image and superscription' of the Almighty. Any perversion of it, therefore, changes its whole nature and character. As an alloy, fused in the furnace of the refiner, detracts from gold, so the gospel is, after some things have been extracted from, and other things mixed with it, no longer the gospel." Where, indeed, allow me to ask, would be the particular advantage of having "respect to all his commandments," if the only way into the Jerusalem above does not lie through the church below?†

No gospel minister, gentlemen, can, consistently with the commission of the Testator, encourage an unbaptized, though apparently repentant sinner, lying on a sick bed, to believe that there is hope for him hereafter; when that minister would shudder to prove the sincerity of his words by administering to him the Supper, thus taking him into fellowship with himself.

There are some persons, again, who affirm that the parable of the householder is in favour of the exception. This parable, indeed, shows the unbounded forbearance and love of God to his creatures, but in a manner very different from that shown to the thief upon the cross; but its design is obviously to show that the labourers who were hired at the eleventh hour were as fit to enter the vineyard, and work (for no invalid, incapable of labour, could expect to be hired), as those who were hired earlier. So the calling of sinners, some in the morning of life, some in the third hour, some in the sixth hour, some in the ninth hour, and some in the eleventh hour, is intended to teach us, that those who are called at the eleventh hour are as fit to enter the church by the way ordained, and as worthy to be partakers of its inestimable privileges and immunities, as those who were called in the morning, or in the meridian of their days.

It is often said, "While there is life, the mercy of God is held out." But there are many exceptions to the truth of this.‡ Besides,

* See Gal. i. 6—9. † Acts ii. 47. ‡ See Prov. i. 24—32; Matt. xxv. 10.

life is often prolonged for a length of time after the faculties are impaired; and as it regards the unbeliever, the cessation of sound intellect and the cessation of hope are simultaneous.

Gentlemen, we are not to suppose that the Lord will, contrary to his apostle's declaration,* begin a good work in any one, and not finish it; or that the mind of an individual is more vigorous, is rendered more capable, and invested with more power to seek the Lord, when the body is infirm, than when it is in vigorous health. It is a well-known fact, that when the body is enervated by pain and debility, the mind is generally softened and subdued in consequence; and those who are so afflicted may, and doubtless often do, imagine that they are repentant and believing, and therefore make great professions; but how often, on their recovery, do we find their imaginations and professions to have been merely the effect of circumstances;† and God alone can correctly estimate the reality of those professions.‡

Again, when an unconverted individual grows old, and becomes what the world calls "pious," both he and the world are too apt to imagine that his present apparent piety will atone for his former transgressions.§ How many there are who apply the words of Peter|| to themselves, and believe that their charity will cover the multitude of their own sins! Fatal delusions, and heinous offences, are these! Would they were less common!

My learned friend asserts that baptism is a symbolical action; and he illustrates his meaning by saying, "We die to sin, or die with Christ, in baptism; because our sins are then forgiven, and we cease to be sinners in God's sight. We rise again, because we are then accepted and adopted by God, and made partakers of a principle of spiritual life. We are 'crucified with Christ,' and we 'put on Christ,' or 'put on the new man,' in baptism, because we then become united and conformed to Christ, and are made new creatures in the eye and estimation of God." This is in accordance with what Paul says, Rom. vi. 3—7, and Col. ii. 12. But can our opponents, by all the twisting and wresting of the gospel at which they are such adepts, make the sprinkling of a babe symbolical of these mighty things? No! Can a babe, gentlemen, which has never been guilty of sin, die to sin, or cease from sinning? Or can it receive pardon for sins it has never committed? Can it, that never knew Christ,

* Phil. i. 6. † See Psalm cvi. 12, 13. ‡ See Jer. xvii. 9.
§ See Mic. vi. 6, 7. || 1 Peter iv. 8.

die with him? Can it be crucified with Christ, before it has learned what crucifixion is? Can it be united and conformed to Christ, before it knows there is such a being? And can it, in the eye and estimation of God, be new made by the falling of a few drops of water from the finger of a priest? These questions answer themselves.

"It has indeed," says my learned friend, "been confidently affirmed, in opposition to the tenets of *our* church and scripture, that true grace is indefectible." Why, gentlemen, as a natural consequence, it must be contrary to *his* church; because, as he himself observes, baptism, by which he presumes grace is actually conferred, is "too frequently unproductive of saving effects." A sufficient proof that there is no efficacy in the rite. But my learned friend furnishes no evidence of the indefectibility of grace being contrary to scripture.

The perseverance of the saints is the next topic to which I shall direct your attention; and I shall prove, in opposition to my learned friend, that it is a doctrine of scripture; first premising, that "they are not all Israel which are of Israel,"* and that some once reckoned as of Israel, are of those described by John; "They went out from us; but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us."†

It is said, "His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and his throne as the days of heaven," &c.‡ "I will bring the blind by a way that they knew not. I will lead them in paths that they have not known. I will make darkness light before them, and crooked things straight. These things will I do unto them, and not forsake them."§ "For the mountains shall depart, and the hills be removed; but my kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the covenant of my peace be removed, saith the Lord that hath mercy on thee."‖ "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand. My Father which gave them me is greater than all. And no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand."¶ "The Father...shall give you another comforter, that he may abide with you for ever."** "Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that

* Rom. ix. 6. † 1 John ii. 19. ‡ Psalm lxxxix. 29—37.
§ Isa. xlii. 16. ‖ Isa. liv. 10. ¶ John x. 27—29. ** John xiv. 16.

one of these little ones should perish."* "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father....For...neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."† These, gentlemen, are the assertions of the Spirit of Him "in whom is no variableness."‡ And they make it abundantly manifest, that where God begins a good work in any individual, "he will finish it."§ "Whatsoever he doeth, it shall be for ever."‖

Hooker, gentlemen, according to his own creed, was certainly correct. For to admit of the "iteration of baptism" would overturn the whole system of the church, because it would be at once denying "baptismal regeneration," and making people doubtful of the genuineness of their baptism. This may be one reason why he was denominated "the judicious;" and may serve to explain why the curates are to be so particular in satisfying themselves, in certain cases, that individuals brought to the font have not been previously christened. If they cannot fully satisfy themselves on that head, then they are to use that accommodating word IF, and say, "*If* thou art not already baptized, I baptize thee."

My learned friend remarks, that "the learned and pious divines to whom the Reformation was entrusted, while they retrenched with an unsparing hand the superstitious practices and unsound doctrines of popery, did not renounce either the tenets or usages of the apostolic and universal church, merely because they had been held, and in some cases perhaps perverted, by the Church of Rome. They were content to lop off excrescences, and to remove corruptions, without destroying the substance of primitive and catholic doctrine."

And further, "When our reformers settled the discipline and compiled the liturgy of our national church, they wisely determined to make no unnecessary changes, nor introduce any novelty in religion. Hence they did not study the scriptures with a view of extracting from them a new form of doctrine or discipline; but they brought every opinion to the test of scripture, and allowed

* Matt. xviii. 14.

† Rom. viii. 15. 38, 39; see also Psalm cxxxii. 13, 14; Isa. lx. 21; liv. 10; Hos. ii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. i. 8, 9; 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; Eph. i. 13, 14; ii. 19—22.

‡ James i. 17. § Phil. i. 6. ‖ Eccl. iii. 14.

none to be valid that was not borne out by it....They were so far from refusing the assistance which the writings of the ancient christians furnished them, that, in the compilation of our Articles and Liturgy, they avowedly acted on the principle of conforming as much as possible to their opinion and phraseology.... Many of the prayers contained in our Service-book are the same, or nearly the same, as were in use previous to the Reformation. It appears that the compilers of our Liturgy were anxious to retain such portions of the ancient services as were consistent with sound doctrine, and free from the corruptions of the Church of Rome."

The correctness of these remarks, gentlemen, coming from such high authority, an authority which appears to concede to the Romish hierarchy the high-sounding title of the "apostolic and universal church," we cannot for a moment doubt; while they make it appear that the reformers searched the scriptures with pre-conceived opinions, prejudiced in favour of ancient writers and ancient usages; and, when they could find no passages that would correspond with these things, they seized upon those that seemed to come nearest to them, and, laying them upon a Procrustean bed, "either mutilated them by violence, or extended them by force," until they made them exactly answer their purpose.

To corroborate the remarks of my learned friend, I shall read you an extract from a work, the writer of which is said to be of some note. "For various reasons," he asserts, "the reformers sought to make a *gradual*, rather than an abrupt, departure from popery. The liturgy accordingly had then, and still retains, many popish affinities. These are seen in the canonizing of saints, and celebration of saints' days; in the absolution of the priests, modified so as to unite the protestant idea of forgiveness of sin by God alone, with the popish absolutions of the priest; in the endless reiterations of the Lord's prayer; in the inordinate prominence that is given to liturgical forms; in the qualified and cautious phraseology of the communion service, and in the special care that *all the consecrated bread and wine* shall be eaten and drank, so that none of it shall be carried out of the church,—a point upon which the Papists are ridiculously superstitious. These popish tenets are seen particularly in the baptismal regeneration of the liturgy, by which the child becomes 'regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ's church.'...The order of confirmation is so conducted as to confirm one in the delusion, that he has become 'regenerate by water and the Holy Ghost,' *through*

the instrumentality of this rite, rather than by that grace which is the gift of God. The Burial Service also is exceedingly objectionable. 'Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God of his great mercy to take *unto himself* the soul of our deceased brother here departed, we therefore commit his body to the ground; earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; *in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life*, through our Lord Jesus Christ.' This is said of every one alike, however profligate his life, however hopeless his death. In the American Service, instead of this, at the grave, it is said or sung, 'I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, 'Write, from henceforth, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord; even so saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labour.' (Rev. xiv. 13.) The practical influence of this service is apparent, from the following remark of Archbishop Whately.* 'I have known a person, in speaking of a deceased neighbour, whose character had been irreligious and profligate, remark, how great a comfort it was to hear the words of the funeral service read over her, because, poor woman! she had been such a bad liver.'"† Our opponents, therefore, should shew, whether it is wise, or prudent, or christian to continue a "Service," which, on such authority, is stated to be the cause of so much practical evil, and which is publicly read almost every hour of every day?

My learned friend asserts, that "we ought to acquiesce in such rules as have been agreed upon...and established by those who have the lawful authority over us;" and yet, gentlemen, you will be surprised to hear that this "Service Book," (to declare there is any thing defective or requiring alteration in which would be regarded by the majority of Churchmen as profane,) is in a measure disparaged by his honest avowal, that it contains "passages of vital importance, not understood by the clergy, and which have a bad effect on the conscientious laity." I shall therefore, for your information, read a few extracts from a work of his lately published,‡ and remark upon them as I proceed.

"We are,"...he says, "compelled to feel that our national ark totters when we mark their (its professed friends and defenders) indecision, provoking a fresh assault, even at the moment they are engaged in a repulse; when we perceive that, tempted by a reputation for discretion, and judgment, and moderation, they main-

* Errors of Romanism.

† See "A Church without a Prelate," by Lyman Coleman, page 95.

‡ Lectures on the Church of England, by the Rev. H. M'Neile, M. A.

tain a forbearance, both in word and deed, which is misconstrued into a betrayal of weakness, if not of disaffection, defending our Established Church on the low grounds of her prescriptive title, her legal claim, her political and social usefulness...bulwarks which, however valuable as outworks, are of man's construction, and may be of man's demolition, but shrinking, to all appearance, from the higher and more commanding position of avowing her scriptural character, and challenging enquiry into her unchanging principles.

"Hence a feeling is propagated that the defenders of our church have themselves some doubts about her character, and are in consequence but half-hearted in their advocacy....If our adversaries point to the differences which exist among us, our answer is ready; we are free men, each exercising his own judgment, without any prostration, under arbitrary authority, upon a Procrustes' bed of slavish uniformity; and yet we have substantial unity....Why should all the defenders of our church use exactly the same weapons? No; to insist on such sameness in our warfare would be to cut down our army to a single regiment. We have no sympathy with those who would so narrow our ground. We desire to war an honest, straightforward warfare in defence of our well-beloved church."*

Well, gentlemen, I am at a loss to see how this can mend his cause. Has he himself, in his opening address, taken the more commanding position, "the scriptural character of *the* Church"? Has he not rather taken that of the character of her rulers? He assuredly cannot challenge enquiry into her unchanging principles, who is an advocate for a change in those principles. We, he says, are free men. Then let him explain why subscription to the whole Prayer-book is required, and why the Rector of Feniton and the Vicar of Liskeard have been prosecuted and suspended by the Bishop of Exeter; let him also explain the sentiment he has expressed, that he is favourable to a collegiate education, because it enables the clergy to appreciate the *blessing* inseparable from subordination, and the consequent *privilege* of the christian of *sacrificing gladly* all the eccentricities of *individual liberty* at the shrine of public order. Truly we may ask, Is this the boasted privilege of the clergy? And alas for "substantial unity!" where is it? "Who," asks his Sixth Witness, who addresses him as his friend and brother, "that knows what christian freedom is, would be a member or minister of a church, the charter of whose very existence is, not the Word of

* Rev. H. M'Neile, pages 2, 3.

God, but acts of the British Parliament; whose standards, whether of faith or practice, cannot be touched without the sanction of similar acts; nor a single form of prayer adopted or altered, or a single bishop chosen, or a single see filled, or a single council held; and which, instead of having within itself in its own independent jurisdiction, the power of applying the laws of Christ for the correction of its own abuses, and the supply of its own defects, must look, and wait, and supplicate for the concurrent authority of the civil courts, and must depend on a condition so problematical, on a hope so hopeless, as that which you thus (forlornly as it would appear even to your own mind,) pronounce 'the only remedy for existing evils.' But in pronouncing this verdict, you are beside the mark. The true remedy for existing evils is the revival of religion, not among our civil rulers, (desirable on all accounts, for their own sakes, and for the country's, as that may be,) but *in the churches themselves.*"*

My learned friend's weapons are not those of the apostle Paul. Paul used one weapon only, "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God."† Gentlemen, the defenders of this church have reason to doubt her character, when they hear her great champion, my learned friend, declaring, "God is free and sovereign, not tied even to his own ordinances."‡ And in another place, on another occasion, that "one consideration there is, which furnishes abundant cause at once for humiliation and for comfort; namely, that albeit we are forbidden to deal loosely, or unfaithfully, with the commandments of the Lord, yet the Lord is by no means tied and bound to the ordinances which he hath himself proclaimed."§

If the foregoing remarks were not directly opposed to the Will, we might with all humility ask, Could not the Most High, with the same justice, condemn those who have walked "in all the ordinances of the Lord blameless," as save those who have "walked after the imagination of their own hearts"? If my learned friend mean that there is any other "way of salvation" for sinful man than that set forth by the gospel, it is no wonder if the people be half-hearted in the defence of such a doctrine.

Why, gentlemen, the very idea that God "is not tied to his own ordinances," may be a principal reason why we have so many different denominations of religious professors? But God has bound himself to abide by his ordinances; by all that he has sworn, said, com-

* Letters to the Rev. Hugh M'Neile, M.A., No. 6, page 85, by Ralph Wardlaw, D.D.
† Eph. vi. 17. ‡ Rev. H. M'Neile, p. 6. § The British Critic, No. 46, p. 267.

manded, and promised. "God is not a man that he should lie, neither the son of man that he should repent; hath he said, and shall he not do it? or hath he spoken, and shall he not make it good"?* "The strength of Israel will not lie nor repent."† "God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the immutability of his counsel, confirmed it by an oath; that by two immutable things, (the counsel of his will, and his inviolable promise,) in which it was impossible for God to lie, we might have strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us."‡ The firm belief that he has so tied and bound himself, is the only "full assurance of hope" which the christian possesses; otherwise he could have no enjoyment, because he would have no security that the Lord, who promises life, may not purpose death; for "if the foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous do?"§

What can the defenders of *the* church understand by the following?—"The unity of the circumcised society was geographical, ceremonial, formal; it was, in truth, strict, unswerving uniformity in every particular of every rite. There was but one form and one place of acceptable offering to God. The unity of the baptized society is not so; not geographical obviously, not ceremonial and formal, because forms and ceremonies, not being ordained in detail by God himself, have been diverse, and may be changed according to the diversities of countries, times, and men's manners; so that nothing be ordained against God's word."‖

Well then, gentlemen, seeing that "the law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did....by so much was Jesus made a surety of a better covenant, and...hath an unchangeable priesthood;"¶ and as that law commanded that everything should be made according to the pattern shown on the mount; how much more must that "better hope," that perfected covenant, bear the divine stamp of an unchangeable pattern? to add to, or take from, or substitute any forgery in the room of which, is forbidden under the most dreadful denunciations.** This, indeed, is what Paul denominates preaching another gospel. Although the doctrine of the unity of believers has never been geographical, it has always

* Num. xxiii. 19. † 1 Sam. xv. 29.

‡ Heb. vi. 17, 18; see also Deut. vii. 9; Psalm cxi. 7—10; Isa. xxiv. 4, 5; lix. 21; Jer. xxxi. 33—36; Ezek. xvii. 19; Mal. iii. 1. 6; Rom. xi. 29; Gal. i. 8, 9; 1 Tim. i. 3, and vi. 3, 4; James i. 17.

§ Psalm xi. 3. ‖ Rev. Hugh M'Neile, page 12.

¶ Heb. vii. 19—21. ** Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

been, is now, and shall be to the end,* in every diversity of climate, centered in Immanuel, and his commandments; in "one God, the Father... and one Lord Jesus Christ;"†... "in one faith, and one baptism;"—the united saints holding "fast the form of sound words,...in faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus;"‡ not living by the precepts of men, but "by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God."§

"As the meaning of the word (absolve) is equivocal, being used here ("The Visitation of the Sick,") as synonymous with declaring or pronouncing, and being used in the first of our forms (or daily service,) as synonymous with the thing declared and pronounced, I cannot withhold my honest conviction that the expression, *I absolve thee*, although thus defensible by a friendly interpreter, is an unwise oversight in the purifiers of the Book of Prayer, inconsistent with our other services, and needlessly prejudicial in wounding the consciences of weak brethren, and multiplying disaffection in various degrees against the church."‖

But, gentlemen, is it not consistent with the "Communion Service," where it is said, "Let him (who has a guilty conscience,) come to me, or some other discreet and learned minister of God's word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's holy word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness"? And is it not altogether consistent with the Baptismal and Burial Service, where the clergy pretend to free infants from condemnation, who are not under condemnation; and who also rob God of his privilege of regenerating a sinner, by pretending to do it themselves, by the sprinkling a few drops of water on his face;—and who commit to the ground every description of character, "in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life"? And whatever and whoever the individual may be; whether an apparent loss to the whole community, or to his or her family,—whether a young and virtuous queen, or a bride or a bridegroom of yesterday, or the first-born and hope of affectionate parents, or one unprepared to meet his God,—the following hypocritical mockery of thanksgiving is offered: "We give thee hearty thanks for that it hath pleased thee (the Almighty,) to deliver this our *brother*," or sister, "out of the miseries of this sinful world;" a thanksgiving, speaking after

* Rev. ii. 25, 26. † 1 Cor. viii. 6. ‡ 2 Tim. i. 13.
§ Matt. iv. 4. ‖ Rev. Hugh McNeile, page 33.

the manner of man, in many cases most harrowing to the survivors, and against which their hearts must revolt. It is easy to perceive that one who "mourneth for his only son," and is in "bitterness for his first-born," * cannot give *hearty* thanks for that which causes his mourning and bitterness.† Besides, life is a gift of such value, that we can easily understand why the Almighty added to the days of Hezekiah fifteen years,‡ and why our Lord restored Lazarus and the widow's son to the renewed enjoyment of it. The Catholics give the following reason for the giving of these hearty thanks; "Is the sinner dead? it is proper to rejoice that an end is put to his sins, that they can no longer be accumulated."§

"It is undeniable that there are passages in some of our services, and those of vital and fundamental importance, which are variously understood by the clergy; and the effect of which, upon the most conscientious and exemplary of the laity, is highly detrimental to the best interests of the church.

"I do not say that it makes them enemies: I do not say that it hinders them from being still friends and supporters. But there are degrees in the cordiality of friendship, and in the unhesitating vigour of support. And I do say, because I have seen and known, that the influence to which I now allude damps the ardour of many, produces at times a secret misgiving within, and a consequent occasional wavering as to prominent and vigorous measures to be adopted without. Unable to give a brief and satisfactory answer when challenged on certain points, many of our friends, from whom we might expect the most distinguished advocacy, shrink from the occupation of a position calculated to provoke the taunting enquiry.... I am tremblingly alive to the delicacy of the ground on which I have now ventured to tread. I have surveyed the host of armed opponents, ready on every side to be roused to active hostilities by the slightest attempt at the addition, omission, or alteration of even a single word in our venerated ritual. I am thoroughly convinced that, at this moment, no proposal, even of inspired wisdom, if we could have it, would secure unanimity of adoption, and give entire satisfaction to all parties. Nevertheless, strong in the consciousness of honest attachment, deeply feeling the necessity of some movement in this matter, if we are to be prepared for the gathering conflict. ... I will

* Zech. xii. 10. † See Gen. xlii. 38. ‡ 2 Kings xx. 6.

§ See Address to the Catholics of the United Kingdom, by J. Berington and J. Kirk, page 365.

suggest what has occurred to me, and scatter it from this place as a seed, either to fructify or to decay as seemeth best to our heavenly Father. The suggestion which I venture to make has this advantage, that it would not erase a word, nor add a word, nor alter a word in any of our services; and yet, if introduced by the proper and competent authorities, it would gladden many a heart that trembles, and strengthen many a hand that hangs down, among conscientious and devoted churchmen.

"It is simply this, that the passages referred to, as they stand in our services, be placed, by authority, between brackets, and the clergy authorised to read, or not to read, those bracketed clauses, according to their varying judgment and convictions. The consequence would be, that no change at all would take place in the practice of some of the clergy; they would read on all occasions, as they do now, the entire service as it stands; others would avail themselves of the conceded option, and omit the bracketed passages, or some of them. And many, perhaps, would read or not read the passages in question, according to the varying circumstances of the particular case. Neither would our uniformity sustain any serious injury thereby."*

Well, gentlemen, you will think this a strange way of establishing uniformity, and will doubtless conclude that it would have the very contrary effect; while it would show that the rulers even admit the Prayer Book to be faulty. Let the clergy themselves, who, according to my learned friend's assertion, are "free men," exercise their own judgment, and at once, without applying to the authorities, omit the objectionable passages. This would indicate their freedom; but alas, his suggestion shows that the clergy are in bondage to the state. And by subscribing to all the "services," they have riveted the fetters upon their own judgment—and have prostrated themselves under arbitrary authority, not daring to exercise their own judgments until that authority gives them free liberty to do so. Without this, it is at their peril if they add to, or omit, a single word in any of them.

Again, my learned friend not only informs us that the outworks of the church are of men's construction, but implies that such is the power of prejudice, that the majority of churchmen prefer harbouring a book in their churches venerable only by age, and which, according to him, contains passages of *rital importance* not under-

* Rev. Hugh M'Neile, pages 101, 102.

stood by the clergy, rather than worship God according to his own directions; and thus they prefer the security of the outworks of man to that of "the wall of fire which is round about" Jerusalem.*

This bracketing, gentlemen, may appear at the first sight specious; but how is it to be subscribed? Are the clergy to be put in divisions, each division to subscribe a certain part? or shall they be allowed to follow the suggestion of the Fourth Witness, and subscribe the whole, with an implied understanding that they need not abide by the subscription? Were subscription, of some sort or other, dispensed with, some individuals might omit more than was bracketed, and confusion would necessarily ensue.

It is evident, indeed, that confusion has already ensued; for it is stated,† that "a twelvemonth back, if even a newly ordained deacon was asked to read prayers, he knew what was meant, and perfectly understood what he was expected to do. But now, should even an experienced clergyman undertake this office for a friend, and rashly venture to commence without obtaining special instruction, it is almost certain that he will be stopped, once, twice, or more probably thrice, in the course of the service, by the clerk or the sexton, with the audible whisper, 'We don't do that *here*, sir.'"

It may have been something of this sort, gentlemen, which gave occasion to the archbishop of Dublin to present a petition to the House of Peers, praying, as is reported by the public newspapers, "that their lordships would take such measures as might seem to them expedient, for remedying the evils arising from a want of church government, for the united church of England and Ireland. ... Now (said the archbishop) it was held, by the political gentlemen of the country, that any direct disavowal of its fundamental principles, or opposition to its enactments, was an act of high treason. Was it not the same in the church? And when men were denounced as heretics, as holding doctrines opposed to the fundamental doctrines of the church, was it not desirable that there should be some authority to determine what were the fundamental doctrines? For he found that, in the allocations of the bishops, all declared that they were friends to the church, and yet there was so much variance in their notions of what were the fundamental doctrines, that some of them were denounced by the followers of the others in the most disgraceful manner. Large numbers of the

* Zech. ii. 5.

† See the Churchman's Monthly Review and Chronicle, June, 1840, p. 457.

clergy had denounced other large numbers, and there prevailed a disgraceful state of dissension and discord, which called for a remedy."

The Bishop of Ripon is also reported to have said, "There was an anomaly in the church, which did not exist, and never had existed, in any other society whatever; namely, that of having no power of self-regulation, to accommodate itself to those changes which take place in society. ... He agreed in what had fallen from the most reverend prelate, that there could be no permanent security for the church, if it were not permitted to accommodate itself to the circumstances of the times in which they lived, and to make those alterations which all who have considered the subject must see to be necessary."

Gentlemen, the Prayer Book, in former days, was supposed to be "the standard of appeal, in all disputes as to what is the doctrine held by the Church of England: the rule and law, both for the governors and the governed." Hence, accordingly, His Majesty's declaration, prefixed to the articles, says, "We will that all further *curious search be laid aside;* and these disputes shut up IN GOD'S PROMISES, AS THEY BE GENERALLY SET FORTH TO US IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, and the *general meaning* of the articles of the Church of England, ACCORDING TO THEM. And that no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the *plain* and *full meaning* thereof: and shall not *put his own sense or comment* to be the meaning of the article, but shall take it in the *literal and grammatical sense.*" And now, gentlemen, after the Church of England has been established nearly three hundred years, it does not appear to have been discovered until lately that, if it ever possessed any fundamental doctrines, the knowledge of those fundamental doctrines has been lost; and that a secular commission is now required to establish others. Gentlemen, how near akin is His Majesty's declaration to the following extract from the Pope's last Encyclical Letter, dated May, 1844: "They (the venerable brethren, with those that have the cure of souls, and other ecclesiastical men,) may never, under any pretext, venture to interpret or explain the divine writings contrary to the tradition of the fathers, or differently from the sense of the catholic church."

But what are we to understand, gentlemen, by "the church" being permitted to accommodate itself to the circumstances of the

times, and making all those alterations which all must see to be necessary? My learned friend has already declared that the national ark, the church, is tottering. Any skilful architect, in such a case as this, would not attempt to make alterations in a falling building, but would at once take it down, and erect a new one in its stead, after another model. We read nothing in the scriptures of the church of Christ accommodating itself to the circumstances of the times, or of any alterations being made in the Will of its divine Head. The church, which is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone,"* is unalterable:† like its own High Priest,‡ it is unchanged and unchangeable; while the heaviest denunciations are once and again pronounced against those who preach any other gospel than that which was first preached by the apostles.§ See also Paul's declaration and exhortation to the elders of Ephesus, how he warned them of the things which we are now experiencing;‖ and his charges to Timothy,¶ and to Titus."** See also what is said of the believers at the day of Pentecost: "They continued stedfastly in the apostle's doctrine," &c.†† I see not, indeed, any reason why the great promises were made to the church of Philadelphia, unless it were for their keeping the word of God, and not denying his name.‡‡ When blame was attached to the church at Ephesus, it was because she had left her first love.§§ Gentlemen, can a body of people among whom there is such "disgraceful dissension and discord;" whose bishops and clergy are petitioning temporal lords "to take measures for remedying the evil arising from a want of a church government;" and which does not appear to know what fundamental doctrine it professes to hold, be a church of Christ? seeing that God "is not the author of confusion, but of peace, as in all churches of the saints."‖‖ If it had ever been a church of Christ, indeed, the following words of the apostle Paul would be most applicable to it: "For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God."¶¶ Under the circumstances then, which now exist,—such "disgraceful dissensions and discord,"—the bracketing system of my learned friend rather pro-

* Ephes. ii. 20.
† Ps. lxxxix. 34.
‡ Heb. vii. 24.
§ Gal. i. 6. 9.
‖ Acts xx. 18—31.
¶ 1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.
** Titus i. 9.
†† Acts ii. 42.
‡‡ Rev. iii. 7. 10.
§§ Rev. ii. 4.
‖‖ 1 Cor. xiv. 33.
¶¶ Heb. v. 12.

mises to increase than to allay the strife; while it will throw further obstacles in the way of a clergyman becoming acquainted with those parts of the service book which his brother clergyman adopts. That it would have both these effects, I think can be satisfactorily proved.

According to the periodical I now hold in my hand, a virtual bracketing has for a long time been tried, and has failed to satisfy all the "conscientious and devoted churchmen." This you will gather from the extracts I shall now read from it. "Some of his clergy had represented to him (the Bishop of London, when the clergy were assembled around him,) that they were 'pressed in conscience,' that they had solemnly engaged to observe and do all that was prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer; while yet, if they conducted the service in the customary manner, they would be disobeying the plain words of the rubric. The offertory sentences were commanded to be read, and also the prayer for the church militant, every Sunday. How, then, could they avoid reading them? 'And how could I,' said the bishop, 'advise or command them to *disobey* the rubric? How could I avoid declaring that the rubric must be obeyed? But having done this, it becomes clearly my duty, as uniformity is desirable and necessary, to extend the same rule to all; and, the system described being rubrical, to enjoin it upon the whole body of the clergy throughout my diocese, without any exception. You now, therefore, know my wishes, and I have no doubt that you will comply with them.'...

"It was a noble stand which the diocese of London recently made, and by which a serious calamity was promptly averted. We now know, that if the recent 'injunctions' had been submitted to, similar attempts would immediately have followed in other dioceses, and a scene of lamentable confusion would have occurred in various parts of the kingdom. The active interposition of the laity averted this, by eliciting the bishop's recent letter, and thus re-establishing the liberty of the clergy."*

The late Dr. Arnold has the following remark: "I see that if attempts be made, as they seem to be, to make the power of the bishops less nominal than it has been, there will be all the better chance of our getting a really good church government; for irresponsible persons, irremovable, and acting without responsible advisers, are such a solecism in government, that they can only be

* Churchman's Monthly Review and Chronicle, June, 1843, pp. 455, 461.

suffered to exist so long as they do nothing: let them begin to act, and the vices of their constitution will become flagrant."*

Gentlemen, the clergy may well call out for the establishment of "fundamental doctrines to decide differences," when one diocesan permits all his clergy to omit one part of the stated service, and another prosecutes and suspends two solitary clergymen for omitting other parts of it; especially where His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury "recommends,...where alterations have been introduced with general acquiescence, let things remain as they are; in those which retain the less accurate usage, let no risk of division be incurred by any attempt at change."†

"There is (my learned friend goes on to say) an appearance, at least, of disingenuousness, which is repugnant to the British character, and which generates a feeling of reserve in the attachment of enlightened laymen, and thereby deprives us of much cordiality of support. There is the *name* of election of their bishop continued to the dean and chapter of the diocese, while the impending penalty of a *premunire*, for refusing to choose the nominee of the crown, renders it little more than a name. This, as might have been expected, is a fruitful source of taunt and reproach amongst our enemies. Neither is this all. It is a source of pain and grief to ourselves. We lament exceedingly the moral effect upon themselves, as well as upon others, of a grave and venerable body being assembled, avowedly and solemnly, before the church and the world, and in the sight of God, to make a choice, when in point of fact they have, and know they have, no choice."‡

Well, gentlemen, this nominal election may be one of the things which my learned friend had upon his mind, when, in his opening address, he said, "Let no man imagine that he has any scriptural right to disobey a law of the state, or disregard a ceremony of the church, however he may personally dislike it, or however inexpedient, or ABSURD, or vexatious, he may consider it, merely because there is nothing concerning it in the Will:" but you would hardly imagine, gentlemen, from all you have heard while sitting in that box, that the clergy of this church, of which my learned friend is the advocate, disunited so widely as they obviously are, can every one of them, through seventeen centuries, have descended in a

* See his Life and Correspondence, vol. ii. page 209.
† See his Letter addressed to the Clergy and Laity of his province, Jan. 11, 1845.
‡ Rev. H. M'Neile, page 108.

direct line from the apostles. Yet this they would have us believe. But we read of false apostles being contemporary with the true ones;* and this circumstance, gentlemen, when considering your verdict, you will have to bear in mind.

My learned friend even has the following remark: "Bradford says, 'We shall not find in all the scriptures this your essential part of succession of bishops. In Christ's church antichrist shall sit.' Bishop Jewel, speaking in the name of the Church of England, in his apology, observes, that 'St. Paul says that antichrist should once set up his own tabernacle and stately seat in the temple of God.'"†

Gentlemen, the true ministers of the gospel are, without doubt, descendants of the apostles of Christ; for the Lord promised to be with such to the end of the world.‡ But whether the true ones are to be found among those who abide by the commission of Christ, or among those who depart from it, "judge ye."

From what you have already heard, gentlemen, you will not be surprised to learn that others, besides my learned friend, are desirous of some alteration in this said service book. A neighbour of his, a clergyman, "doing duty" in the same town in which he officiates, has petitioned "The Lords spiritual and temporal," &c., on the subject. A few extracts from his petition I beg leave to submit to your attention.

"That your petitioner sees that it is provided by the Act of Uniformity that if any minister shall speak anything in derogation of the Book of Common Prayer, he shall, if not beneficed, be imprisoned one year for the first offence, and for life for the second; and if he be beneficed, he shall, for the first offence, be imprisoned six months, and forfeit a year's value of his benefice; for the second offence he shall be deprived, and suffer one year's imprisonment; and for the third offence shall, in like manner, be deprived, and suffer imprisonment for life. And if any layman shall speak any thing in derogation of any part of the said Book of Common Prayer, he shall, for the first offence, forfeit one hundred marks; for the second offence, he shall forfeit four hundred marks; and for the third offence he shall forfeit all his goods and chattels, and be imprisoned for life. That your petitioner entertains a high veneration

* 2 Cor. xi. 13.

† The Rev. E. Bickersteth, in his Treatise on Baptism, page 295.

‡ Matt. xxviii. 20.

for the Book of Common Prayer as a whole, although he may not consider it perfect in all its parts. That your petitioner cannot but think it altogether unwarrantable to throw such protection around a book of human composition. That your petitioner never heard of such reverence being enjoined by the laws for any book of human composition, save the Koran of Mahomet, the acceptance of which was enforced by pains and penalties, under the pretext that it was dictated by an angel of God. That the Bible itself (although blasphemy is punishable by the laws of the land,) is not surrounded with such protection.... That your petitioner has good reason to believe that many of the clergy, and a large number of intelligent and conscientious lay-members, of the Church of England, are of opinion that some alterations might be made in the Book of Common Prayer, which would promote the cause of true religion, and conduce greatly to the welfare of the church itself. That your petitioner believes that some of these persons are anxious gravely and respectfully to urge the propriety of making certain alterations, but they cannot do so without in some measure 'speaking in derogation' of some parts of the Book of Common Prayer, and thus incurring terrific pains and penalties, to which they may be unwilling to expose themselves; that they would, for instance, believing that God alone hath power to forgive sins, declare it to be their opinion that it is presumptuous, to say the least of it, in any minister of religion to address a sick person, however sincere he may believe such person's penitence to be, in the following unqualified words: 'By his (namely Christ's) authority, committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;' or that, in conformity with the sentiments of the late Bishop Prettyman, who has recorded his declaration that, in his judgment, 'our church would have acted more wisely and more consistently with its general principles of mildness and toleration, if it had not adopted the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed;' they would, with that charity which the apostle says 'hopeth all things,' declare it to be their opinion that these clauses are unworthy of being admitted into the confession of faith of any body of christians, and highly injurious to the interests of the Church of England. That your petitioner believes, that although many alterations might be suggested by different persons, a few only would satisfy the greater portion of objectors, and that the argument which has often been used, namely, 'that it is dangerous to countenance

the contemplation of any alteration in the Liturgy, as there is no knowing where it may stop,' is an argument which ought not to be listened to by any person of sound understanding. Your petitioner therefore humbly prays that your Right Honourable House will not only endeavour to repeal the clause to which he has alluded, in the Regency Bill, but will also endeavour to make such alteration in the Act of Uniformity as shall allow any minister of the church, or any layman, reverently and fearlessly to give public utterance to his opinions relative to such parts of the Book of Common Prayer as he may in conscience think demand revision, so that the Church of England may no longer labour under the reproach that she defends her Liturgy by the terror of the law, while she fears to submit it to the test of argument."*

Thus, gentlemen, we see that the words of the Holy Spirit may be mangled almost with impunity; while, according to the law of the state, the punishment of a similar offence against the rubrics, is, after one or two fines and imprisonments, excommunication, one of the only three things to which "christian burial" is denied. You are aware how much of the time of Parliament, year after year, is consumed on church questions—questions respecting her temporalities; but on those of her spiritualities, seldom or never. You are aware, too, what volumes upon volumes have been written by the clergy on the Rubrics; how they ought to be understood—how they ought to be acted on—and, above all, on the absolute necessity of abiding by the whole of them. But has there been a single volume written by any of them, to point out how the whole tenor of the book comes short of the standard of the Will—the Will which shows "unto us the way of salvation"—"the truth which shall make us free"?

You have observed, gentlemen, how tremblingly alive my learned friend is to the tottering state of the church, and how fearful he is that she will be unable to withstand the storm that he sees "*gathering*" around her. He is aware of the risque of removing one of her unsubstantial pillars, even with a view to replace it by a stronger one, lest in loosening one part of the fabric, the whole should fall.

Thus we see, gentlemen, "old systems dissolving, creeds and forms of human workmanship are falling to pieces; the spirit of enquiry seems to be moving the whole mass, and heaving to and fro all societies. A crisis of unparalleled importance appears to be

* Signed Edward Hull. See Liverpool Times, April 16, 1844.

approaching, when all false religions must pass away. But he who formed from ancient chaos a universal light and loveliness, will from the present and coming chaos form a new creation, more lovely and more glorious than the first. It is the Spirit of God which is now moving through the nations, who, in his own good time and way, transforms all things according to his own will."

My learned friend may reply, that Churchmen constitute only a part of his clients. Admitted; but then the next larger part of them are those who stand in a most peculiar and equivocal position, being neither Churchmen nor Dissenters; those who, in their reformation, followed in the footsteps of the Episcopalians, lopping off from the church of the latter a few of her "excrescences," as she had previously lopped off a few of those of the mother church, yet still retaining many of the old forms and usages. Another part, again, though actually denominated Dissenters, still adhere to the first principles of the church which they have quitted. While another part, though professing to reject those first principles, still look back with a child-like affection to those who hold them, and are proud to be considered of the same kindred;—a proof, gentlemen, that no reformation of error can eradicate error.

Reformation, gentlemen, according to its true, legitimate, scriptural meaning, is the destruction of every form of worship that is at variance with the gospel—the leaving behind all "carnal ordinances"—and the worshipping "the Father in spirit and in truth," as directed by the Testator and his apostles. Such is the reformation we read of in the 9th and 10th chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

When the Testator said, "It is finished," the veil of the temple was rent, to indicate that the way into the holiest was then laid open to all believers, and that the Mosaic dispensation, with all its rites and ceremonies, had ceased. At his resurrection, he gave his disciples their commission, which, with his previous instructions, and the further teaching of the Holy Spirit, was to be the pattern of the New Testament worship. To this reformation the majority of the Jews objected, and determined to be no parties to it. In consequence of which, Jerusalem and the temple were razed to the ground; this, although it prevented the continuance of the ancient ceremonies, there being no legal place to kill the sacrifices, and keep the feasts, did not cause the Jews to abandon their typical worship. In their error they have remained, even to the present day; and are thus

the living witnesses of the justice of the Most High, who, from generation to generation, visits the sins of the fathers upon the children, so long as they continue to walk in their father's steps; exhibiting at the same time a striking illustration of the power of prejudice, which nothing but an Almighty arm can subdue. Under Divine guidance, man may be the means of subduing it in some few instances immediately around him, but these instances are comparatively few.

My learned friend may then ask, Are we never to have a scriptural reformation? I answer, Yes; but the time "is not yet." From the tenor of prophecy, matters may proceed for a great number of years as they are now proceeding. What the world calls charity, will abound more and more. Men shall send gifts to each other,* as they are now beginning to send compliments; and all denominations of professing christians regard each other as brethren, something after the manner which is now being attempted by what is called an "Evangelical Alliance." Controversy, so far as regards the truth, will cease, and the generation of christians will become almost extinct; or, perhaps, so far as that there will be few or no assemblages of them. Thus will the two Witnesses (the testimony of the Son of God, and of the Spirit of truth,) be killed, and lie dead in the streets.† And then, and not before, will the iniquity of the world be full. But while this declension from the truth is in progress, the gospel will be spreading throughout the whole world.‡ For this grand purpose, the ingenuity of man is continually at work, although the real purport for which that ingenuity is bestowed and exerted is unknown to himself; "he being in the hands of the Lord an unconscious instrument, who, in seeking his own profit, fame, or amusement, through the expansion of his own faculties, makes, unawares, a step forward in promoting the will of God;" as the Lord said of Cyrus, "I girded thee, though thou hast not known me."§ The water of the great river Euphrates is being symbolically dried up;‖ the tongue of the Egyptian sea is being destroyed;¶ *i. e.*, the way is being made clear for the spread of the gospel—land and water are traversed with a velocity hitherto unknown, or even imagined—plans to bring the world as it were into one focus, are day after day submitted to public attention—commerce is continually extending—men are going forth in great numbers to people,

* Rev. xi. 10. † Rev. xi. 8, 9. ‡ Matt. xxiv. 14.
§ Isa. xlv. 5. ‖ Rev. xvi. 12. ¶ Isa. xi. 15.

civilize, and cultivate the earth, which was not created to lie waste; also the willingness with which men come forward to support the Bible Society; and last, though not least, the highly favourable termination of the war with China,—the greatest event, regarded in its ultimate results, which Great Britain has ever achieved,—an achievement highly favoured of the Supreme Being, as a means of introducing into that vastly populous country the "light of life:"—all these things are ordained of God for one mighty purpose, and when that mighty purpose shall have been accomplished, the Witnesses shall revive;* Dagon shall fall "upon his face to the ground, before the ark of the Lord,"† and not even a "stump" be left to him; and then, as appears by the latter and following passages, shall commence that terrible, that horrific day, when all nations shall drink of the cup of the Lord's fury;‡—that day, of which the tremendous destruction of Jerusalem was only a faint type: "Our God shall come, and shall not keep silence; a fire shall devour before him, and it shall be very tempestuous round about him."§ "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted."‖ "For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch."¶ "Immediately after the tribulation of those days (the destruction of Jerusalem,) shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of heaven shall be shaken. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn; and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory."** "And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, and every bondman and every free man hid themselves in the dens and in the rocks of the mountains; and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb."†† This will be the awful reformation, when God will "over-

* Rev. xi. 11—19. † 1 Sam. v. 4. ‡ Jer. xxv. 15—38.
§ Psalm l. 3. ‖ Isa. lx. 12. ¶ Mal. iv. 1. ** Matt. xxiv. 29, 30.
†† Rev. vi. 15, 16. See also Psalm xcvii; Isa. ii. 10—19; xxiv. 17—23; xxx. 25. 27, 28; lxiii. 1—6; lxvi. 15, 16; Joel iii. 9—17; Hab. ch. iii.; Zeph. ch. i.; iii. 8; Matt. xiii. 41, 42; Luke xxi. 10, 11. 25, 26; Acts iii. 23; 2 Thess. i. 7—10; ii. 8; Rev. i. 7.

turn, overturn, overturn, and it shall be no more, until he shall come whose right it is, and I will give it him;"* the reformation when the earth shall be made to bring forth in one day — when a nation shall be born at once† — when the Spirit shall be poured from on high, and the "wilderness be a fruitful field, and the fruitful field be counted a forest,"‡ &c. — when Antichrist shall be destroyed, and the true Christ shall reign in the hearts of men.§ Thus, as the literal Israel was not delivered from Egypt until the wrath of God was poured down upon his enemies, so the true Israel will not, according to the passages just quoted, be delivered from her's, until the threatening contained in these passages be visited upon those that hate her.‖ And "as all the righteous blood which had been shed upon the earth since the foundation of the world came upon that generation who crucified the Lord in person,¶ so shall all the righteous blood shed upon the earth since that time come upon the generation who shall kill him in the testimony of his word and his Spirit."**

You cannot but have observed, gentlemen, how my learned friend's arguments neutralize themselves, as arguments founded on error generally do. On the one hand he repudiates "baptismal regeneration," and on the other he maintains it with all his might. And I must be excused for expressing my surprise and regret that my learned friend has nothing of a more consolatory nature to support him, than a retrospective view of what he supposes he once was. I would that he had a present knowledge of the forgiveness of his sins; and that he could experimentally say, "They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint;"†† "they go from strength to strength, every one of them in Zion appeareth before God."‡‡ "The righteous also shall hold on his way, and he that hath clean hands shall be stronger and stronger."§§ I would that he could forget "those things which are behind, and reach forth unto those things which are before."‖‖ Judging from my learned friend's address, the little knowledge he possesses is at best but second-hand; in the strictest sense of the word, he was a non-consenting party to his supposed

* Ezek. xxi. 27.
† See Isa. lxvi 5—14.
‡ Isa. xxxii. 15, 16, 17, 18.
§ See Isa. chapters xxxiv. xxxv.
‖ Mic. vii. 15—17; Luke i. 70, 71; xvii. 26. 30.
¶ Luke xi. 47—51.
** Rev. xi. 7—19.
†† Isa xl. 31.
‡‡ Psalm lxxxiv. 7.
§§ Job xvii. 9.
‖‖ Phil. iii. 13.

regeneration; and, as I have before remarked, there can, in a great number of cases, be no other evidence of that kind of regeneration than the parish register.

That my learned friend should support the doctrine of original sin, is natural and consistent; it is so closely connected with infant christening, that both doctrines must stand or fall together. But from the trembling and delicate manner in which he introduces it, we may infer that he thinks the authority for it doubtful, since he admits that it is a doctrine which the scriptures touch with a moderate and sparing hand. "Scripture," says he, "uniformly speaks of the sinfulness of man in a practical and experimental manner." In this sentiment we are one with my learned friend; but then he further says, "Besides the conclusions which are deducible from scripture by means of analysis and induction, and the brief but pointed account of the fall, there is in one passage, Rom. v. 12, &c., in which the original evil is referred back in express terms to Adam's transgression; and the prevalence and universality of sin are accounted for upon principles of an hereditary infection. Man is therefore considered as lying under a sentence of condemnation, and tainted with moral evil in consequence of the guilt of our first parents." And again, "the apostle Paul does not tell us what is the precise nature of that condemnation which has been brought upon us by the fall, independently of our own personal sins; nor does he attempt to define the extent and virulence of that infection of nature which has been entailed upon us by descent and derivation."

It is obvious, gentlemen, that my learned friend has touched very slightly upon the doctrine; when, besides the conclusions which are deducible from scripture, by means of analysis and induction, he can only find one passage and its connexion which he thinks refers to it; while, to our minds, that passage and its connexion proves the reverse of what he imagines them to prove. What says the passage? "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "This has regard to our first parent; for it is in him we sinned, having no distinct powers or faculties of our own, but being seminally in him, the representative of us all; for in his sin we lost all the blessings that he lost through it, as he could not convey to his posterity what he himself had lost." But what says the next verse, the 18th, the intervening ones being a parenthesis? "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to con-

demnation, (which condemnation was, 'unto dust thou shalt return,') even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." Or, in other words, as we all lose our present life through the sin of Adam, so we shall all have that life restored through the obedience of Christ, without any accountability attaching to us for Adam's sin.* And here, in the full sense of the word, Christ tasted death for every man.† Should an extravagant and reckless parent waste all the property he once possessed, and thus lose all control over it, of necessity leaving his children to beggary, the children surely are not to be blamed for it. No: they are but the more compassionated. But who ever thinks of restoring them to their former condition? How much greater, then, is the love of our Creator, who not only compassionates us, but, through the atonement of his beloved Son, will raise again all innocents to the same state of felicity which Adam enjoyed before his fall;‡ and who now gives to every sinner, who has the Bible in his hands, the means of attaining to a glory which Adam in his best days, was, so far as we know, unacquainted with. If any sin had attached to us on account of Adam's transgression, the apostle Paul would have made it known; otherwise, in the face of his own declaration,§ he would have shunned to declare unto us all the counsel of God.

Gentlemen, the counsel of God *has* told us what is sin,—that it "is the transgression of the law,"‖—and has not only guarded us against it, but has shown us the way of escape from its contaminating and deadly effects.¶ "What could have been done more to my vineyard that I have not done in it?"** is the word of the Almighty himself. While the curse entailed upon females is admirably tempered, and in a great measure recompensed, even in this life. There is no earthly pleasure to be compared with that which a kind mother feels when she is fondling her infant in her arms. Well might the Testator say, "She remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world."††

I will here, gentlemen, beg to remark, that the following verse, the 19th, "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous," appears to have a meaning widely different from that of the 18th.

* See Ezek. xviii. 20. † Heb. ii. 9. ‡ Jer. xxxi. 17.
§ Acts xx. 27. ‖ 1 John iii. 4. ¶ 1 Acts ii. 38.
** Isa. v. 4. †† John xvi. 21.

The latter imports that as *all* men die a common death through Adam, so *all* will be again raised to a state of existence through Christ; the former, that as Adam was the means of introducing sin into the world, by setting an evil example to his descendants, which example all have more or less followed, many were made sinners,* so, by Christ's bringing pardon and justification into the world, many, by believing in him, shall be made righteous. From the mode of expression, may we not derive the idea, that as many, or even more,† will enjoy eternal happiness through the righteousness of Christ, as will for ever be miserable through the introduction of sin by Adam.

From statistical accounts, it appears that one-half of the human race die under five years of age. Thus one-half of the human beings who have already existed will, from the whole bearing of the Will, be eternally happy. Then, may we not scripturally calculate, that the seventh day of the world, or the seven thousandth year, will produce more people than the previous six? Because in that day the vices of men, and many things which obstruct the production of our species and shorten natural life, will be removed. When Christ shall come, in the power of the gospel, "there shall be no more thence an infant of days, nor an old man that hath not filled his days. Nothing detrimental to the increase and well being of men shall exist. ‡ And as in that day the diffusion of the true light shall be sevenfold, § we may infer that the population, whose hearts will be proportionably prepared to receive it, ‖ shall be sevenfold also; nay, we see no reason why it may not increase to seven times sevenfold; ¶ nor is it too much to suppose that man may again live as long as some of the antediluvians lived,** since even now, in this country, while the amount of dissipation remains much the same, the duration of life is, through civilization *alone*, considerably on the increase.

"If the whole world were peopled in the same proportion as the British isles, there would be about two hundred and twenty times as many inhabitants as there now are in the united kingdom; or the globe would contain 6,600,000,000; being at least eight times its present population. When the vast superiority of the productive

* Ephes. ii. 2, 3. † See 20th verse.

‡ Isa lx. 18—22; Isa. lxv. 17—25; Ezek. xxxiv. 25. 31.

§ Isa. xxx. 26. ‖ See Isa. xxix. 18, 19; xxxii. 3, 4; xxxv. 5—8; lii. 8—10.

¶ See Isa. ix. 7; xlix. 20; Jer. xxxi. 27, 28; Ezek. xxxvi. 8—15; Zech. x. 10.

** See Prov. iii. 2. 16; iv. 10; xi. 11; Zech. viii. 4.

powers of the southern regions of the globe are taken into consideration, as well as the great increase which it has been shown the British isles themselves can be brought to yield; (say, according to other statistics, food for 120,000,000;) when it is recollected that, in almost all the southern climates, two crops are obtained in the year, from soil where irrigation can be attained; that the potatoe will maintain three times as many human beings on an equal extent of ground as wheat; and the banana, according to Humboldt, five and twenty times as many; it is not exceeding the bounds of reasonable argument to hold that this number, 6,600,000,000, might with ease be raised to 20,000,000,000, being above twenty times the whole probable population of the globe at this period."*

Now, gentlemen, if half the population of the globe were to double itself every five years, from infants being born into the world with sound constitutions, growing up in that state, and continuing much longer in their prime, and taking into account the consequent higher ratio of increase, we may well believe that, from natural causes alone, the population may amount to the number last mentioned. The remarkable increase of the Israelites in Egypt, although Pharaoh exerted all his power to prevent it,† strongly corroborates this view of the case, and shows how much more confidently we may look for such a result, when God shall take to himself his great power, and shall reign.‡ When his Spirit shall go forth in far greater power than even in the days of the apostles, then shall its "sweet influences" descend on all mankind; and the earth, participating in the blessing, shall yield the abundance of food required for so dense a population.§ Thence are we authorised to conclude, that the number of the saved shall greatly preponderate over the number of the lost. And the scripture warrants such a conclusion; for the number of the blest shall be "ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands;"‖ "a great multitude which no man could number."¶

The exhortation or encouragement attendant on the first blessing was, "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth."** This clearly teaches that, from the first, the Creator designed that the whole of the earth should be inhabited. Nor shall his purpose fail.

* Principles of Population, by Archibald Alison, F.R.S.E., Vol. I., pp. 66, 67.
† See Exod. ch. i. ‡ See Rev. xi. 17. § See Zech. viii. 12.
‖ Rev. v. 11. ¶ Rev. vii. 9.
** Gen. i. 28; ix. 1; see also Gen. xxxv. 11.

It shall be inhabited.* While the more densely it shall be peopled, the more will the glory of God be promoted,† and the more extensive the fulfilment of the promise made to Abraham.‡

I come now, gentlemen, to matters respecting which, so far as I understand my learned friend, we are again agreed, namely, the nature of man in his present state, (though I object to his expression "inherent bias to evil," as incorrect,) and that the gospel is preached to him as a sinner. We are unable to form an adequate conception of the extent of the change that would take place in our nature, were young children to witness a good example only. That the bias would then be incomparably greater towards good than towards evil, we may scripturally conclude; for although, in the majority of cases, they witness little else than evil, still good qualities predominate. How much more then shall this be the case when ALL shall be taught of the Lord.§ Children will at that time indeed be born into the world with the same constitution both of body and of mind as they are now; but then, owing to the almost entire absence of sin, both body and mind will be in a healthy state.

Parents in general are not sufficiently impressed with the awful situation in which they are placed with respect to their offspring. To a great extent they are responsible for their future conduct and their eternal well-being;‖ and they should remember that they come into the world free from "ideas or prejudices of any kind." Their "minds (says one who is highly esteemed among the Plaintiffs,) are white paper; you may write upon them what you will."¶ "They have nothing in their constitutions which has a direct or invincible tendency to form their moral characters; but they are at a very early period susceptible of deep, if not of indelible impressions from external objects. These have at least a considerable influence on their future modes of thinking and acting, and should therefore be carefully watched," so that nothing erroneous or unscriptural be imprinted upon them. The apostle Paul informs us, that the Saviour of the world was in all things made like unto his brethren;** he had therefore a similarly constituted mind; while the same apostle further informs us, that we (himself and his fellow-saints,) "were by nature," *i. e.*, by following evil example, "children of wrath, even as others."††

* Isa. xlv. 18. † See Isa. xliii. 6, 7.
‡ Gen. xiii. 16. § Isa. liv. 13. ‖ Prov. xxii. 6; Eph. vi. 4.
¶ Matthew Henry on Mark x. 15. ** Heb. ii. 17. †† Eph. ii. 2, 3.

It is not unusual for parents, when they see a child do wrong, even in its playful mood, to smile, rather than to correct it; nor when it manifests a little self-will, to encourage that self-will by granting it everything it cries for, rather than apply to the rod.* How often, too, is deception, in one shape or other, practised before them; and how many misnamed *kind* parents ruin their offspring, by pampering them with indulgences, and poisoning their young minds with flattery, a thing which is detrimental even in infancy; while no parents can tell the extent of evil which their children imbibe, either from the nurses to whose care they are often committed for the greater part of the day, or from their earliest companions. It is indeed no uncommon thing for shrewd children, of four or five years of age, to rebuke, and retort upon, their parents, for using language or committing acts in their presence contrary to what they had previously taught them. These things, gentlemen, originate a great portion of our depravity; and we are scripturally authorised to assert that children generally receive more injury from their parents and immediate progenitors, than either they or their fathers received from Adam.†

Then, as parents prosper in the world, they will have their children educated accordingly. But to this objections may be urged; and it would be well for christian parents to bear in mind, that not many wise men after the flesh attain to spiritual wisdom;‡ but the question is, as all ought to be educated, How and where is the safest manner of educating them—in public schools, or by private teachers at home? Where parents are prudent, doubtless the latter; where they are imprudent, the former. But the great mischief with respect to schools is, that the higher and fashionable ones command the preference, while generally the little that is taught in them militates either directly or indirectly against the teaching of the gospel.

A late eminent teacher has said, "Of all the painful things connected with my employment, nothing is equal to the grief of seeing a boy come to school innocent and promising, and tracing the corruption of his character, from the influence of the temptations around him, in the very place which ought to have strengthened and improved it." And again, "I am a coward about schools, and yet I have not the satisfaction of being a coward, κατὰ προαίρεσιν; for I am inclined to think that the trials of a school are useful to a boy's after cha-

* See Prov. xxii. 15.

† See 2 Chron. xxx. 7—9; Jer. xvi. 11, 12; Ezek. xx. 18. 30; Luke xi. 47, 48; Acts vii. 51, 52.

‡ See 1 Cor. i. 26.

racter, and thus I dread not to expose my boys to it; while, on the other hand, the immediate effect of it is so ugly, that, like washing ones' hands with earth, one shrinks from dirting them so grievously in the first stage of the process."*

I cannot conceive, gentlemen, that the "after character," the foundation of which is laid in these schools on the corruption of the moral character, can be followed with the blessing of God; or how a christian parent can deliberately send his child to be thus demoralised.

Again, an author of some experience has lately said, "The sending of children to a foreign country, (to be educated,) I consider so full of dangers, that I am not prepared to recommend it at all. On the contrary, it is in my eyes so hazardous, both to the physical and moral constitutions of youth, that it ought not to be done, except with the utmost care and caution, and is what I could not undertake to advise." On this passage one of his reviewers remarks, "He has not adverted to some considerations which we consider to be of great importance — we mean the desecration of the sabbath, which is common to nearly all the continental nations, and the want of that 'form and pressure' of domestic piety which in England constitutes one of the most important elements of practical religious training."†

There is also another consideration; if I am correctly informed, but few schools are considered of the first class except those in which the Church catechism,—that summary of untruths,—is taught; in fact, that the use of it is essential to the prosperity and popularity of a school.

After the first rudiments of knowledge have been imparted, the nobility, gentry, and many of the prosperous merchants and tradesmen, send their daughters to the most fashionable and popular schools, either in London or on the continent, where their companions and manner of education too often corrupt the tender mind; while not a few of the sons of the wealthy are sent to those hotbeds of dissipation, Oxford and Cambridge, where false doctrines and vicious practices are engendered, and false principles instilled, whence ultimately they are disseminated throughout the kingdom. It is asserted, in returns which the directors of the Home Missionary Society have received, "that besides the heretical teachers sent out in swarms into every accessible parish, by the notorious Tractarian

* The Life of Thomas Arnold, D.D., late Head Master of Rugby School, vol. 1, pages 94. 277.

† Howitt's German Experiences, page 71.

University, there is an immoral influence spreading around that seat of learning of the most fearful kind. The population of the small towns and large villages within a radius of twelve or fifteen miles from Oxford, is declared by good men to be corrupted to the very core by the *profligacy* of the students. We write advisedly when we say, that the young men from Oxford, subscribers to the Thirty-nine Articles, have, within the limits above named, been the corrupters of the female sex to an appalling extent — so great indeed that it almost exceeds credidility."* Other seminaries of evil training might be enumerated, such as race-courses, gambling-houses, theatres, operas, naval and military depôts, and particularly, in time of war, government ships; and last, though not least important, the drive in Hyde Park, which can be regarded by every enlightened mind only as a HIGH SCHOOL of Sabbath desecration. And it is most strange, gentlemen, that all these sources of moral contamination are negatively, if not positively, patronized by the Head of the Church, the reigning Monarch, the Lords and Commons united; and stranger still, that the chief, nay almost the only actors at these places, are those whom the Establishment declares to be THE REGENERATE.

These things, gentlemen, duly considered, will satisfy you that we have among ourselves abundant sources of the evil which prevails, without making our first parent answerable for it all. It is men themselves who are to blame; men who are at once the corrupters of their own way and of the way of God.† The general system of education on which I have descanted is in virtual disobedience of the course which the Testator inculcates on his intelligent creatures.‡ The young are taught to seek first the things of this world, in preference to those of the kingdom of God; and who does not see that such education is far more calculated to contaminate the soul, than to meliorate the disposition or enlighten the understanding?

That man, after his first transgression, was not in a state of body and mind so deplorable as some affirm that he was, may be argued from a comparison of the duration of life before and after the flood. Now, we are a short-lived puny race; then, according to the genealogy of the patriarchs contained in the Bible, their lives ranged from 777 to 969 years. (Enoch was not an exception; he died, but not the "common death"; he was changed, according as we read, 1 Cor.

* See the Voluntary Churchman, October, 1844.

† Gen. vi. 12. ‡ Matt. vi. 33.

xv. 51, 52.) In Seth's time men began "to call upon the name of the Lord."* But "when men began to multiply,...and daughters were born unto them, ... the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all which they chose."† This was their crowning sin, more fatal in its immediate effects than the sin of Adam; for it was the chief cause which brought almost immediate death, in the fullest extent, upon a whole world, with the exception of eight persons; yet after the Lord had thus made known his displeasure, the children which were born even of these marriages "became mighty men, which were of old, men of renown."‡ It was in consequence of man's personal, individual, and collective sins only, that the old world was destroyed. "God looked upon the earth, and behold it was corrupt, for ALL flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth;" Noah having been the only exception.§ After the flood, the first great sin that brought down a general punishment was the building of Babel. It is unnecessary to enquire what was the real demerit of that sin—whether it was to prevent their dispersion, or to make them a name, or for what other evil purpose; of this we are not particularly informed, and it is not necessary that we should be. The builders knew it; and it is sufficient for us to know that the sin was their own, and that in consequence of it their language was confounded, and they were scattered,‖ "to replenish the earth,"¶ as originally designed. And as all the inhabitants of the earth then spake the same language, so in the latter days, when the ultimate purposes of the Almighty shall be accomplished, shall all again speak the same language, the pure and spiritual language of the gospel of Christ.**

It is manifest, from the fact that God established his covenant with Noah and his seed, that while they remained together they had the pure worship of God among them, although but few might have attended to it. And we may scripturally presume that their sudden dispersion was caused by the general wickedness of the people; and that the negligence and forgetfulness of the divine laws, by the body of them, increased in proportion to the distance they wandered from the place of departure, until the knowledge of God and his laws had become extinct among them; and that ultimately their minds and bodies became reduced to the degenerated,

* Gen. iv. 26. † Gen. vi. 1, 2. ‡ Gen. vi. 4.
§ Gen. vi. 12, and vii. 1. ‖ Gen. xi. 6—8. ¶ Gen ix. 1.
** See Zeph. iii. 9.

barbarous state of the present heathen world. Notwithstanding this general corruption, however, the Lord, as I have before observed, has always retained a seed to serve him. This seed descended from Noah, through Shem, to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and David, down to the days of the Testator, and from him, through the apostles, to the present day. After the flood, the length of human life began rapidly to shorten, caused, as we may presume, by man's increasing wickedness, until the days of David, when it was fixed at "threescore years and ten."

Thus it is obvious that man has reduced himself to his present condition by his personal sin. And even in his best state, it is painfully evident that he has deprived himself of numerous advantages, both of mind and body, which Adam, after his fall, bequeathed to his posterity. Still there is much of native good yet remaining in him. What noble actions do we frequently hear of,—actions which may be termed almost superhuman,—of men, without fee or reward, risking their lives, and often perishing, in the attempt to save their fellow-men, of whom they know nothing; and this not under some stirring excitement of the moment, but after due deliberation. How many upright, moral men are there, who know not God, and yet walk after many of his commandments—who expend a great portion of their time and wealth in endeavouring to benefit their fellow-creatures, and who would shrink from a dishonest or ungenerous act. These are examples of native goodness worthy of the highest praise. Still, being the works of the creature only, they do not advance him one step towards eternal life. The latter, I presume, is the sort of character hinted at by the Third Witness, who, having been regenerated in infancy, needs "no further conversion;" but even such men as these,—and it is a "hard saying,"—are still in "the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity." There is no difference, in the eyes of the Testator, between the man who thought the gift of God might be purchased with money,* and the man who thinks it may be purchased by good works.† As for his baptismal regeneration, if he builds upon that, he only aggravates his sin. In good works, what man could surpass Zaccheus? yet he was in a state of condemnation, until Jesus said unto him, "This day is salvation came to this house."..."For the Son of man is come to seek and to save that which was lost."‡ The gospel does not in the remotest degree diminish the obligation of obedience to the moral

* Acts viii. 20. † Rom. iii. 20. ‡ Luke xix. 8—10.

laws of God; it only changes the principle." The natural man obeys, in order to obtain pardon; the spiritual man obeys, because he has already obtained it. The former, from mercenary motives; the latter, from gratitude and love."

My learned friend asserts, that, upon common principles of interpretation, the promise of our Lord, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved," implies that every man to whom the gospel is preached may, if he will, believe and be saved. I do not see, gentlemen, how, according to John v. 40, and the following passages, this can be denied. The scriptures are addressed to every man, as if he had the power to accept the good and refuse the evil. Moses said to the Jews, "I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live."* "Seek ye me, and ye shall live."† The Testator says, "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me,... and ye shall find rest for your souls."‡ "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely."§ Further, man is personally blamed for rejecting the advice of the scriptures, and refusing the call of the gospel;‖ and he is shown that, however unhappy he may be in the world to come, he will ultimately be convinced that he himself has been wholly and solely the cause of it. "This," says the Testator, "is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."¶ Now, gentlemen, we maintain that these passages negatively show that the gospel is proclaimed to all men, and that on no other ground could blame attach to all who disregard it.

Every unrenewed man in this country knows that he is a sinner, and under the sentence of eternal condemnation, however he may try to conceal from himself the unwelcome truth; he knows, too, that the instruction contained in the scriptures is the only thing that can extricate him from it; and he knows also, or might know if he would, that all those instructions are addressed to him indi-

* Deut. xxx. 19. † Amos v. 4. ‡ Matt. xi. 28, 29.

§ Rev. xxii. 17; see also 1 Kings xi. 38; Ps. l. 23; Prov. ii. 2—5, and viii. 1—17; Isa. lv. 1—3; Mal. iii. 7; Matt. x. 32; xvi. 24, 25; John iii. 16, 17; Acts xvii. 30; Rom. x. 13.

‖ See Prov. i. 23—31; Isa. lxv. 12; lxvi. 4; Ezek. xviii. 30—32; Matt. xi. 20—24; xxiii. 37; Acts xiii. 46; xviii. 6. ¶ John iii. 19.

vidually, and addressed to him also on the principle that he has the power in himself of profiting by them. That he has this power to a certain extent is undeniable, as is shown by the passages already quoted; and yet, not so far as to make himself the author of his own salvation; for "by grace are ye saved, through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God."* Yet both the Giver and the gift may, without a shadow of doubt, be enjoyed by all who look for them with their whole heart and soul, in the way appointed; for God himself declares, "I have not spoken in secret, in a dark place of the earth; I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain: I the Lord speak righteousness, I declare things that are right."† And again, "Ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart."‡ "And I will give them an heart to know me, that I am the Lord; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God; for they shall return unto me with their whole heart."§ Again, it is said, "Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord; his going forth is prepared as the morning; and he shall come unto us as the rain, as the latter and former rain unto the earth."‖ And the crowning declaration is, "Him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out."¶ Nevertheless, "Thus saith the Lord God, I will yet for this be enquired of by the house of Israel to do it for them."**

Therefore, gentlemen, let us look upon this momentous matter in whatever light we may, it is manifest that if an individual die in his sins, he has himself only to blame for it. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live," &c.†† While every man who does indeed turn from it takes no merit to himself, but renders all the praise to God, who had regard to his prayers, and who opened his heart to repent and believe the gospel."‡‡

The doctrine that Christ shed his blood for the salvation of the whole human race, is most clearly and satisfactorily proved by various passages of the word of God. The Testator himself says, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved."§§ And John, person-

* Eph. ii. 8. † Isa. xlv. 19. ‡ Jer. xxix. 13. § Jer. xxiv. 7.
‖ Hos. vi. 3. ¶ John vi. 37. ** Ezek. xxxvi. 37.
†† Ezek. xxxiii. 11. ‡‡ Mark i. 15. §§ John iii. 16, 17.

ating the church, says, "He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world. ... And we have seen, and do testify, that the Father sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world."* Paul says, "Who (*i. e.* God our Saviour) will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth."† "Heaven and earth," says the Testator, "shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away."‡

Nevertheless, gentlemen, it is equally clear from scripture, that "there is a peculiarity in the virtue of his blood for the elect, and a peculiarity in the communication of the gospel to them." The Testator says, "All that the Father giveth me *shall* come to me."§ "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing; but should raise it up again at the last day."‖ "As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou has given him."¶ Paul says, "Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling; not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began."** "For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him amen, unto the glory of God by us."††

And, gentlemen, it is not less in accordance with scripture, that no individual can, in the first instance, come unto God, as one of his elect; because there is nothing inherent in man to convince him that he is one of that number. All must alike approach him, drawn by the general proclamation of the gospel, as "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked;" and when he answers their petitions, by opening "their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures,"‡‡ and encourages them to come boldly unto the throne of grace, that they may obtain mercy,§§ He, on the profession of their faith, sends his Spirit to bear witness with their spirit that they are the children of God.‖‖ Thus are they convinced that they are of that number which shall never perish.

In John vi. 37, we have both the doctrine of election and the doctrine of the applicability of the scriptures to every sinner; and although, as I have before observed, there is a peculiarity in the

* 1 John ii. 2, and iv. 14. † 1 Tim. ii. 4; see also John i. 29. ‡ Matt. xxiv. 35.
§ John vi. 37. ‖ John vi. 39. ¶ John xvii. 2.
** 2 Tim. i. 9; see also Matt. xxiv. 22, and Ephes. i. 4—14.
†† 2 Cor. i. 20. ‡‡ Luke xxiv. 45. §§ Heb. iv. 16.
‖‖ Rom. viii. 16.

communication of the gospel to the elect; there is, nevertheless, an apparent oneness between the two doctrines. It is not for us to decide how that which is declared of, and promised to, the elect, can be reconciled with that which is declared and promised to every repentant sinner. Here we must leave the subject, resting satisfied that the promises are to all who will in the way appointed accept them; as it is said, at the conclusion of the gospel, "Whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely."*

But it is time that I should pass on to the consideration of another subject. My learned friend now attempts to maintain the establishment on civil and political principles only. "It is," says he, "interwoven with all our history, our institutions, our laws, our usages, our associations, and all our habits. It comes to us by descent; its roots have mingled themselves for ages with the roots of popular opinion, linked with the memory of our ancestors, and the pecuniary rights and interests of the existing generation; and our monarchial constitution would be shattered by its decay." Well, gentlemen, although I think my learned friend is very unnecessarily alarmed, still, whatever may be the consequences, those who would "follow the Lamb," are called upon to leave "the dead to bury their dead." "Commotions of all sorts are to be deprecated; but if a healthy state of christianity cannot be attained to without them, come they will, as assuredly as, when the elements are charged with impurities, the storm comes to clear them."†

Can my learned friend point out a country in the world, where an established religion has not kept the human mind in the worst description of bondage; and where it has not been a drag-chain on every improvement tending to the amelioration of the state of man?

Gentlemen, that my learned friend is fearful that he has not yet brought you over to his views is evident, or he would not have detained you by reading the following statement of Dr. Osgood's, who says, that, in fragments of ancient writings, he finds "unquestionable evidence that infant baptism was the general practice in the very century after the apostles," &c., &c. Well, admitting that it was, (though it is hard to be credited,) this would not prove that it was the practice of the apostles: but this it does prove, that if the doctor and my learned friend could discover satisfactory evidence of infant baptism in the writings of the apostles, they would not have had recourse to the writings of the primitive fathers. And

* Rev. xxii. 17.

† See Isa. i. 19, 20; Ps. xcvii. 1—7.

who are these *primitive fathers*, from whom my learned friend and his church are so anxious to draw their example and precedent? Are they not men whom, in the early ages, superstition canonised as saints, and whose canonisation superstition acknowledges to this day? And in leaning upon them, our opponents pass by the teaching of the Testator and his apostles, to trust "in the staff of this broken reed."* It is against the teaching of such fathers—fathers who preach another gospel—that Paul denounces the most dreadful anathemas;† while the Plaintiffs make it but too manifest that they themselves "have committed two evils: they have forsaken" God, "the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."‡

But what, after all, is the amount of information which the doctor derives from the fathers? Why, from Justin Martyr, that his writings *imply* infant baptism; from those of Irenæus, a more full testimony; that is, some further implication; from those of Origen, that the church received a tradition, or order, from the apostles to *administer* baptism to infants. From other *traditions*, the doctor discovers, that, one hundred and fifty years after the apostles, baptism was universally considered as taking the place of circumcision; and that it was decided by sixty-six bishops that baptism ought not to be deferred until the eighth day; and also that there was a *probability* that some of the bishops might have been contemporary with many that had lived within the time of the apostles, and must have known what their practice was. He then asks, Is it credible that all the churches of Christendom should so soon and so universally have departed from the apostolic institution?

Gentlemen, it is not credible, but it may be a fact, that those which he styles churches, were no more churches of Christ than were the ten tribes, who, after they had revolted, worshipped the golden calves.

Again, he says that it is beyond all belief that such innovations should have been received without a single objection. I admit it, gentlemen; it is beyond belief. But then, the learned doctor ought to have proved to us that the writings of the "*primitive fathers*" have come down to us in their integrity, and have not been purposely mutilated, in order to deceive posterity, by withholding from them everything that had a tendency to shake established prejudices He affirms that Irenæus was born before the death of John. Well, and

* Isa. xxxvi. 6. † Gal. i. 6—10. ‡ Jer. ii. 13.

suppose he was; might he not have been born of one of the many antichrists that the Evangelist mentions?* My learned friend must have a very poor opinion of your judgment, gentlemen, when, to strengthen his cause, he brings forward such additional meager evidence as this.

"If there be any truth in history," he remarks, "their (the Baptists) opinions are wholly modern, and unknown to antiquity." Also, "that three centuries ago there was not a society of baptized christians in the world." These assertions he cannot prove; therefore they are "good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men."†

Gentlemen, you are not strangers to the fact, that during the dark ages christians were not only hunted and destroyed like wild beasts, but they were persecuted after the manner of the Old Testament saints, whose persecution was typical of theirs. They "had trial of cruel mockings and scourgings, yea, moreover, of bonds and imprisonment. They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were slain with the sword; they wandered about in sheep-skins and goat-skins, being destitute, afflicted, tormented; (of whom the world was not worthy;) they wandered in deserts, and in mountains, and in dens and caves of the earth."‡ Thus were the holy seed nearly exterminated, and the remnant hid themselves; so that their being unknown to the world for seven hundred years, or even to the commencement of what is called the "Reformation," will excite no surprise. And if, as Dr. Mather relates, the "Baptists admitted into their society persons whom our churches had excommunicated for moral scandal," he would do well to prove that the moral scandal of which he accuses them was anything more than exposing the errors to which the reformers still adhered. We must be careful, gentlemen, how we admit evidence which descends from a prejudiced, a persecuting, or an impure source.

But were it admitted that the German Anabaptists did engraft voluptuousness on religion, and thus prove themselves reprobates, that surely is no reason why we should "set at nought the institution of God." No! but the contrary rule ought to be followed by our opponents; they should set at nought infant christening, because it is a rite engrafted on the holy institution of God, by the mother church; and, according to my learned friend, is degraded (if it were possible such an irrational and unscriptural rite could be degraded,)

* 1 John ii. 18. † Matt. v. 13. ‡ Heb. xi. 36—38.

and made subservient "to all sorts of follies—christening of bells, and horses, and asses, and everything calculated to degrade it."

Antiquity, gentlemen, is a very indefinite term; as it regards our cause, it carries us back to the commencement and completion of the gospel of Christ. That there has always been, from the time of the apostles, a generation of genuine christians, I have already shown; that the church has been driven into the wilderness, by the powers of hell, is also manifest, from Rev. xii. 14; and it is equally manifest that she will remain there until the expiration of the stated period of 1260 years. When that period commenced cannot exactly be ascertained; but there are visible signs that its conclusion is approaching. Nevertheless, as long as she does remain in the wilderness, so long, as a natural consequence, will she remain unknown to the carnal historian.

Again, says my learned friend, "If we are able, as in this question concerning infant baptism, to trace the practice of it up through all preceding ages to that of the apostles, it must be allowed a strong presumptive argument in favour of its having originated with the apostles themselves." This little monosyllable IF, gentlemen, is a sad barrier to our opponents; but were they able even in this instance to surmount it, what would they gain? A strong presumptive argument only; and this presumptive argument would at once be quashed by the declaration of John, that in his day there were many antichrists; while Paul also informed the Thessalonians,* that the "mystery of iniquity" did then already work. This mystery of iniquity, therefore, while it had its commencement in the time of the apostles, rolled from Judea onwards, until it enthroned itself at Rome, and from that city ramified over the whole world. Let the unprejudiced carefully consider the following texts, and say if they have not a prophetic allusion to every pope that has filled, or shall fill, the papal chair: 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4; 1 Tim. iv. 1—3. Yet the pope and his adherents are not, as many think, the only antichrist: every individual who does not worship God according to the instructions contained in the gospel is not less an enemy of Christ.† And if popery is justly denominated the Mother of Harlots,‡ her progeny cannot be otherwise than unchaste.

From present appearances, it is not improbable that popery may be again the established religion of this country. My learned friend even is not at his ease on this matter; it is reported that he has

* 2 Thess. ii. 7. † 1 John iv. 3; 2 John vii. ‡ Rev. xvii. 5.

expressed a fear that Protestantism may once more succumb to the power of Romanism;"* and that "the signs of the times respecting a temporary triumph of popery correspond very much with the prophecies indicating the same thing. When we see that on Feb. 13, in this year, (1845,) three hundred and eighty-six members of convocation at Oxford refused to admit that an English clergyman had been guilty of bad faith, who asserted that in subscribing the articles he renounced no one Roman doctrine; that five hundred and forty-four members of convocation have published their thanks to the proctors for negativing a proposal to condemn Tract No. 90; that out of twenty-four colleges at Oxford, fifteen have tractarian tutors; that out of sixty-four tutors, only twenty-two are anti-Romanists, and twenty-five are tractarian, the remaining seventeen being neutral;—that it has been said by a tractarian journal, apparently on good grounds, that of two hundred and thirty resident members of convocation, only forty-eight were opposed to the views of Mr. Ward, and that in one large college of one hundred and eighty-eight, only one voted against him; and that at Cambridge, a society so papal as the Camden, should have gained such influence; what true Protestant can but be anxious for our country. When we witness government, at all risques of its stability, and after all past experience, while our beloved Queen has sworn in her coronation oath that popery is idolatrous, withdrawing our many testimonies against it, and supporting its institutions, and favouring this idolatrous religion—true christians cannot but discern the imminent danger of our country from revived popery."†

That my learned friend is so fearful of his church succumbing to the power of Rome, doubtless arises from this, that he cannot satisfy himself that it is built upon that Rock, of which it is said, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."‡

We cannot be surprised, gentlemen, if popery should be again paramount, when one supporter of the Establishment declares that the ruler of it is without a conscience; and when another, in the person of my learned friend, makes it manifest that a great portion of the teachers of protestantism, immediately under the ruler, are at heart catholics. No other result can be expected. Were popery again to be established, and in its very worst form, it could only be regarded

* Rev. Hugh M'Neile.

† The Signs of the Times in the East, by the Rev. E. Bickersteth; preface, pages 13, 14.

‡ Matt. xvi. 18.

by all christians as a just judgment on protestants, for not making a better use of their liberty while they had it. And then, how few there are, in comparison of the whole, who do not still hold some of the grossest of its errors.

My learned friend admits that "the scriptures are at last our only sure guide;" why then has he not more frequently referred to them? The reason is doubtless this, that out of the whole Bible he cannot produce, on which to base his argument, a single text that could for a moment withstand either "winds" or "floods." He has therefore recourse to other authority, even the traditions of men, from which he can gather no more than that infant christening was practised in former days; which is not a whit better proof of its being according to the Testator's commission, than is the practice of it in the present day. I am at a loss to discover, from his definition of a church of Christ, what it really is. It seems to me, that he classes all sects among the ancients, that have made any show of religion, under that head; which is as rational as it would be to class the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenians, and Herodians under the head of Christians.

Observe also, gentlemen, how unreasonable and unjust our opponents are; they christen a child before it is able to answer for itself; and when it is come to years of maturity, and the man finds that he is in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity, and cries, "What must I do to be saved?" they, to keep their system entire, instead of answering him after the manner of Peter, "Repent, and be baptized," furnish, according to my learned friend, an answer something after this sort; You must retreat upon your christening, when you were born anew, and introduced into the heavenly society of saints. If you find that, by your own wilful default, or that of your sponsors or parents, you have lost your birthright, you are undone. For as Christ died but once, and you were naturally born but once, so you have lost that new condition of life which "is, by *one* only actual administration, for ever available."

Gentlemen, neither dipping or sprinkling a child, nor sprinkling or dipping a man, while in a state of unbelief, is the baptism inculcated in the Will. Those who are so sprinkled or dipped, are no more baptized than they are circumcised; the latter, indeed, stands more in need of conversion and baptism than other sinners, because he has committed a more hypocritical act. The dipping of a man, before his heart has been opened of the Lord, is unavailable; this is pointed out to us in Acts xix. 1—5; the individuals there

alluded to had been baptized in ignorance, by some impostor as ignorant as themselves, and therefore their baptism was a nullity. This is indubitable: for John, before he baptized his converts, preached to them the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.* But these individuals knew nothing of either of the three characters, for the apostle said to them, "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus," *i. e.*, baptized for the first time; it is not said they were baptized again. And after Paul had laid his hands upon them, they spake with tongues and prophesied. This was at once a proof that they were then born of God, and furnishes a precedent to all churches of Christ, to regard those who have been baptized in ignorance as they would regard any other convert; and consequently not to receive them into their community, previous to their being baptized on a confession of sin and a profession of faith. To act otherwise, indeed, would be a virtual acknowledgment that the baptism of an unbeliever is the baptism commanded by the Son of God, or, in other words, valid baptism, and thus to "make the faith of God without effect."

We certainly ought to feel much obliged to the Plaintiffs, who, according to my learned friend, are not seeking merely to establish their own claim, but hope by their success in satisfactorily establishing it to furnish a means of opening the eyes of their opponents; assuring them, that should they be led to see their errors, and inclined to turn from them, they shall be received with open arms. That they are aiming to attain both these things, we have no reason to doubt; and we feel satisfied that when we are inclined to return, we shall meet with the assured reception. But to all the flattering things they have addressed to us, we must be "like the deaf adder, that stoppeth her ear, which will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely."†

My learned friend would make it appear that the Testator abrogated the rite of circumcision, and retained the use of water, which the Jews had previously established; and that hence it is by some denominated a borrowed rite.

Baptism, gentlemen, was never commanded as a ceremonial ordinance under the old dispensation, and my learned friend has not

* John i. 31—34. † Psalm lviii. 4, 5.

attempted to prove that it was ever practised before the time of John. And if there be one sin which is more likely than another to call down the especial anger of God, it is that of introducing into his worship unauthorised things, or of interfering with and neglecting those which he has commanded; of which I have already given you sufficient proofs.

My learned friend has informed you, gentlemen, that the Plaintiffs have custom and precedent on their side. But you are well aware that this can profit them nothing, seeing it is not the custom and precedent of the scriptures, but of men only. And you have had proof of the inefficiency of the evidence of those leaders of the multitude, popular and learned "divines." But at this you can feel no surprise, as you know from the Will that "all the world wondered after the beast. And they worshipped the dragon which gave power unto the beast."* And you know also that the forty and two months† during which they should continue so to wonder and worship have not yet expired.

My learned friend, at the conclusion of his address, gave you to understand that he trusted more to the evidence of his Witnesses, than to his own knowledge of the Will; and they have deceived him, every one of them having broken down, and proved himself like the staff of a broken reed, "whereon if a man lean, it will go into his hand."‡

In short, gentlemen, the tendency of the whole of the statements and arguments of our opponents is to the conclusion that they think themselves in error; while both the learned Counsel, and every one of his Witnesses, has in some way or other pronounced our doctrine to be the doctrine of Christ, and shown that their objections are not so much to the doctrine, as to my clients, because they are constantly reminding them of their evil ways, and refuse, in "the things pertaining to the kingdom of God,"§ to hold intercourse with them. These are the things which cause a painful and unpleasant feeling among them; the things which point out that we think the gate as strait, and the way as narrow, "which leadeth unto life," as each of them was on the day the Testator made the declaration recorded by the Evangelist:‖ while, on the contrary, the majority of our opponents would make it appear that the gate is so wide as

* Rev. xiii. 3, 4. † Rev. xiii. 5. ‡ Isa. xxxvi. 6.
§ Acts i. 3. ‖ Matt. vii. 14.

to be easily found, and the road so broad as not to be mistaken; that the former is sufficiently roomy to admit, and the latter sufficiently spacious to let pass, every denomination of people whom they pronounce "good" and "pious," in contradiction to the word of God, which declares, "few there be that find it."

Now, gentlemen, as I have before proved to you that the Plaintiffs' Witnesses have conceded all that our opponents brought us here to defend, I shall, in the last place, prove to you that their Counsel and Witnesses have given indubitable evidence that the doctrine of christening infants, the utility of which was the chief thing they came here to substantiate and maintain, is, according to their own showing even, a useless act.

My *learned Friend* asserts, "that baptism (christening) has become a cover for delusion—a rest on an outside service—a charm to insure our salvation; that there has been in the Protestant Church much of superstition in holding baptismal regeneration; that he rejoices in the thought that the *consistent* piety and *real* devotedness to God our Saviour of many who reject infant baptism, entitles them to *brotherly* esteem and *cordial* affection;" that "if baptism can do them (children) no good, it can do them no hurt;" that "we observe baptized children who appear in no respect to be renewed; that we do not hold that infants dying without baptism are undoubtedly damned; and though we do not venture to speak peremptorily of their condition, we leave them without despair or distrust in the hands of a merciful Saviour."

Again, speaking of parish church christenings, he admits that "there is much inevitable confusion and consequent want of reverence and solemnity; that the baptismal service degenerates from the highest exercise of the church's faith, into a lifeless and superstitious form; that we have at best no more than cold correctness of official repetition, the essential and fervent spirituality of the service itself tending but to exhibit, in more glaring and painful contrast, the unimpressive, and to all appearance the unbelieving, manner of its administration."

It is said of Dr. Watts, that he had not observed any benefit arising from the ordinance to children.

The First Witness denounces, in the strongest language, what he calls non-elect infant damnation, as having sprung from Moloch.

The Second asserts, that it is not said that he that is not baptized shall be damned, because it is not the *want*, but the contempt

of baptism that damns, otherwise children might be damned for their parents' neglect.

The FOURTH follows in the same strain; he asserts that it cannot be the *want*, but the contempt of baptism, which must condemn us; that if baptism and being born again invariably accompany each other, so that all that are rightly baptized are regenerate, and none other; then all who die unbaptized, even infants, are shut out of heaven; a proposition far more dreadful than any held by the most unfeeling and presumptuous supralapsarian Calvinist.

The FIFTH says, "There is, I think, reason to hope well concerning unchristened children, dying in infancy."

The SIXTH, "Far be it from us to *deny* that infants may be acknowledged to be of the kingdom of God without baptizing them. Far be it from us to pass any such sentence of exclusion against the children of our Baptist brethren."

The SEVENTH, "We must not assert that baptism is indispensable to salvation."

The EIGHTH, "With respect to those (the baptized children of believers,) God has been pleased to lay himself under a more particular covenant; whereas the other are left more to his uncovenanted mercy. Infants dying such, there is good reason to presume, pass into such a state (a state of probation). Now, as in our present state of trial some are placed in circumstances far more advantageous and favourable than others, so *probably* it is in this state to which dying infants pass."

The NINTH, "We *gladly* admit, in opposition to the Calvinistic Baptists, that all children dying before actual sin committed are admitted into heaven."

In order to save the time of the Court, gentlemen, I will sum up the foregoing evidence, that you may at a glance see its full bearing. The rite of christening, according to the Counsel and his Witnesses,—

Is made a cover for delusion—a charm to secure salvation—is a cause of much superstition—has never any visible appearance of utility—never any observable benefit arising from it—is often attended with confusion, want of reverence, and superstition—is, what they concede to their opponents, by implying that the children of the latter, although unchristened, are on a level with their own; and that they can leave their own who die unchristened without *despair* and *distrust*. They admit, also, that if there be any difference

between the christened and the unchristened, it is that the former will *probably* be, in a state of probation, more favourably situated than the latter—that it is also of such trivial moment, that infants are not condemned for *want* of it—that it is not indispensable to their salvation—that there is reason to hope well of ALL infants, that they may be acknowledged of the kingdom of heaven without it—that it is *gladly* admitted ALL children, dying such, are admitted into heaven—that to hold that those who die *un*christened are shut out of heaven, is more presumptuous than that of any unfeeling supra-lapsarian—that the doctrine of non-elect infant damnation has sprung from *Moloch*—and that there is to the infant neither good nor hurt in it.

That such a rite, avowed even by our opponents to be useless, is not only not commanded of God, but is altogether of man, therefore you will readily conclude that men prepossessed with erroneous opinions will contend for them to the death, rather than bend their minds to prove and correct them by the standard of truth; nor will you hesitate to concur with an ancient writer, one learned in the scriptures, that "Satan is innocent of the device, as he never could have imagined that man, even in his fallen state, could be so ignorant as to be deluded by christening infants, a thing so palpably incongruous." Your verdict, then, can do no other than show, even out of the mouths of the Counsel and his Witnesses, that the Plaintiffs' "bed is shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it, and the covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it."*

And now, gentlemen, being assured of your verdict, I shall take leave of my learned friend with becoming respect, and with all due courtesy refer him and his Witnesses to Deut. xxxii. 28, 29, and 1 Kings xviii. 21.

* Isa. xxviii. 20.

DEFENCE.

After a short pause, the Counsel for the Defendants resumed his address, as follows:—

My Lord and Gentlemen of the Jury,

Before I proceed further, I beg leave to state, that I do not stand before you in the defence of those who are denominated either strict or open communion Baptists. Their acts and opinions, so far as I am acquainted with them, are in many respects indefensible; and I do not recollect reading in any of their works,—and I have read a great number of them,—sufficient evidence to satisfy me that they themselves generally feel assured that they are standing upon the "Rock of Ages." If they were so assured, they could not, as they are now in the habit of doing, associate as brethren with the various sects around them,—sects to which some of them do not scruple to attribute "the very spirit of antichrist," nor to assert that they are deluded by the inventions of the mother of harlots, observing the inventions of men as the institutions of God,—sects whose opinions and principles are the very reverse of what the Baptists profess to maintain. Whether their mistaken and spurious charity arises from want of confidence in their own doctrine, or want of courage to maintain it, or lack of both, I leave it to them to explain. If they are convinced that there are as many ways to the kingdom of glory as there are religions,—and those who "admit that persons mistaken about the mode and subjects of baptism may be among the most eminent and the most useful servants of God," must think so,—why then do they dispute about that which is best? Why not let every man take the one he thinks broadest and smoothest? But if there is only one narrow way, and the gate leading to that narrow way is so strait "that few there be that find it,"* does it not behove

* Matt. vii. 14.

every christian to post himself at that gate, and proclaim to all that turn to the right hand or to the left, "This is the way, walk ye in it."*

Such Baptists as these are justly and ably reproved in a work not long since published, entitled "Modern Immersion not Scripture Baptism." And although I differ from the author on his main subject, as much as the brightest day differs from the darkest night, yet I agree with him in his criticism on those whom he calls his BAPTIST BRETHREN, for whose benefit and future guidance I shall read a short extract from his work. They may indeed pronounce his criticism *repulsive* and *distasteful*, but it is nevertheless true.

"By adopting the plan of OPEN COMMUNION, they practically concede the validity of our baptism, as respects both the mode and the subject. As they profess to act only from plain examples or apostolic precepts, and as they can find neither in the New Testament for receiving persons at the Lord's table, after christian baptism was instituted, who in the judgment of the first christians were not baptized, we must take it for granted, notwithstanding all their evasions on this subject, that they consider pedobaptists really baptized.... The majority of anti-pedobaptists are advocates for STRICT COMMUNION, and consequently will suffer no pedobaptist to sit down with them at the Lord's table, because in their opinion he has not been baptized. In this they act in harmony with their own scheme of interpreting the Sacred Volume in respect of positive institutions, seeing, as said before, they can find no precedent in the New Testament for admitting people to this sacrament who in the judgment of the apostles were not scripturally baptized. These very persons, however, will admit pedobaptists into their pulpits; listen with delight to their discourses; will cordially unite with them in prayer and singing the praises of God. But can they find any precedent for such practice? Did the apostles adopt or sanction such a procedure? Will our brethren point out an instance in which the first and inspired ministers of Christ tolerated persons whom they deemed unbaptized to preach in their churches, or to lead the devotional services of their solemn assemblies?"†

Behold, gentlemen, severe but deserved criticism — criticism which must pierce the heart of those to whom it applies. Yet, piercing as it is, it is softened down by addressing them as BRETHREN. And whence comes this mutual brotherly feeling

* Isa. xxx. 21. † Pages 69—71.

between two parties whose doctrines are apparently the antipodes of each other? Is it not, as Mr. J. R. Godley (whom I have before quoted,) truly remarks, "that no man can believe in what he professes, if he believes at the same time that what another man professes has an equal chance of being true in the points of difference which exist between them;" seeing that there is only *one* way;* "one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one faith, one baptism?"† And has not Mr. Godley's remarks been lately illustrated in the House of Commons, by a protestant noble lord, who is reported to have said, "I cannot bear to hear the Catholic religion called idolatrous, because I am not convinced that the religion I profess is the true one?" If the hope of the Baptists in question were well grounded, it is difficult to imagine how they could truckle to their most bitter opponents, as they now do, and be dumb as sheep before the shearers, while under their excruciating lash! No, gentlemen, if they knew "their election of God,"‡ they would evince their confidence in it by following the advice of Paul,§ and no more address the opponents of the gospel by the endearing name of brethren, which, with few exceptions, they are in the constant habit of doing. On the contrary, they would follow Paul's further advice, and "avoid them."‖ And would it not be well too if they would keep in remembrance the remark of their late brother Ivimey, that "the Baptists would soon become hewers of wood and drawers of water to the Independents"?

And for the further guidance of those who "advocate strict communion," I shall, with your permission, gentlemen, read a few extracts from Gregory's Works of Robert Hall, in order that they may contemplate them.

"Many whom you (strict communionists) exclude from your communion as unbaptized, you acknowledge as christians, and without hesitation express your confidence of meeting them in glory. Did the apostles entertain the same judgment respecting such in their day? Would they not without hesitation have applied to them the language which our Saviour uses respecting such as refused to be baptized by John, whom he affirms to have "rejected the counsel of God against themselves"?¶

"However our opponents may deviate from scripture, let them at least be consistent with themselves, and either follow out their

* Jer. xxxii. 39. † Eph. iv. 4., 5. ‡ 1 Thess. i. 4.
§ 2 Cor. vi. 13—18. ‖ Rom. xvi. 17. ¶ Vol. ii., page 274.

own principles to their just consequences, by withholding from the members of other denominations every token of fraternal regard, or freely admit them to the Lord's table. As the case stands at present, their mode of proceding is utterly untenable. In a variety of instances they indulge themselves in those acts of communion with pedobaptists which are peculiar to christians; they frequently make them their mouth in addressing the Deity; they exchange pulpits, and even engage their assistance in exercises intended as a preparation for the eucharist; and after lighting the flame of devotion at their torch, they most preposterously turn round to inform them that they are not worthy to participate. It would be difficult to convince a stranger to our practice that it were possible to be guilty of such an absurdity. Is the observance of an external rite, let me ask, a more solemn part of religion than addressing the Majesty of heaven and of earth? and shall we depute *him* to present our prayers at His footstool, who would defile a sacrament with his presence?"*

"The advocates of strict communion have invented a new classification—a division of mankind into the world, the church, (by which they mean themselves,) and an immense body of pious pedobaptists who are comprised in neither of the preceding classes; their charity forbidding them to place them with the former, and their peculiar principles with the latter. It is unnecessary to say how far these maxims deviate from christian antiquity, nor is it easy to conceive the astonishment their avowal would have excited in the breasts of the Cyprians and the Austins—I might add, of the apostles and evangelists of a former age. Guided by the simple dictates of inspiration, accustomed to contemplate the world under two divisions only, that of believers and unbelievers, they would doubtless have felt themselves at an utter loss to comprehend the possibility of the existence of an equivocal race, who are to be treated as heathens *in* the church, and as christians *out* of it; and while they possess whatever is necessary for an instant translation to glory, are disqualified for the possession of the most ordinary privileges of the christian church."†

But, my lord and gentlemen, I stand before you in defence of the ordinance of the true God, "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," which baptism was instituted by God himself, through the medium of his servant John, that by it the believer

* Vol. iii., page 444. † Vol. ii., pages 456—458.

should manifest his dependence on his well-beloved Son for the forgiveness of all his iniquities; the same baptism which was, as a fulfilment of righteousness, and as an example for all his people to follow, observed by the Saviour of the world; who, immediately after he had been baptized with water and the Spirit, and given proof, by withstanding all the temptations that Satan could devise, of his fitness for the priesthood, preached that doctrine;* the same baptism which, simultaneously with John,† Christ baptized with; and who, after he rose from the dead, said to his disciples, "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations."‡ The same baptism which Christ, without addition or diminution, as it had been instituted by his heavenly Father, established by his commission for an everlasting covenant, to be observed by every genuine believer until his second coming.§ The same baptism which was illustrated by Peter at the day of Pentecost, and again by Ananias,‖ and which was taught by Paul.¶ I stand in defence also of the mighty and momentous truths revealed in the gospel—mighty, as they "are the power of God unto salvation," and momentous, as they involve the eternal welfare of all mankind.

My clients, gentlemen, are those "of every kingdom, and tongue, and people, and nation," who "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth;"** those who reject the traditions of men, and who "hold fast the form of sound words ... in faith and love, which is in Christ Jesus;"†† those who believe that on the right reception of the gospel depends their everlasting happiness;‡‡ those who show their consistency, by neither admitting the unbaptized into the church below,§§ nor encouraging the hope that they will be admitted into the Jerusalem above.‖‖

To be enabled, by the help of the Holy Spirit, to establish an unalienable title to our heavenly inheritance; to be made instrumental in promoting the cause of God, in combating error, in exposing prejudice, and in divesting our opponents of the cloak of righteousness, will be an honour for kings to envy, an honour in comparison of which all earthly honour is "as the shadow which declineth."

* Luke vii. 24—35. † John iii. 26. ‡ Luke xxiv. 46, 47.
§ Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. ‖ Acts xxii. 16. ¶ Acts xix. 4.
** Rev. xiv. 4. †† 2 Tim. i. 13.
‡‡ Mark iv. 20; Acts xvii. 11, 12; 1 Thess. ii. 13. §§ Acts ii. 41.
‖‖ Mark xvi. 16; John iii. 5.

Those with whom I have the happiness and privilege to be in immediate fellowship are few in number, and little known; they have a church in Comus-street, Liverpool; at Millington, near Warrington; at Butt's Green, near Halifax; at Newark; at Wisbech; at Norwich; and at Towcester; standing in close connexion with each other; each church, however, being independent in itself.

They conceive of unity of judgment in the truth of the gospel, as most important to the building up of the christian church; and that no modification of the ordinances of the gospel can be permitted; for which reason they do not hold fellowship with any other denomination of Baptists.

They believe that immersion in water is the only ordinance taught in the scriptures, by which a believer can make his first profession of faith in Christ; consequently they do not recognise any unbaptized person as a member of Christ's body. They receive individuals, after baptism, as members, into the church by the ordinance of laying on of hands, with prayer, in faith of the gift of the promised Spirit. By the latter ordinance, also, ministers and officers of the church are inducted into office.

Their view of the doctrine concerning the one true and living God, is not in agreement with the Trinitarian scheme, as generally held. They are of opinion that the characters by which God has revealed himself are, as in relation to us,—that the Father is God, the invisible and incomprehensible Jehovah; that the Son is this glorious Being in manifestation in our nature, as "the Word made flesh;" that the Holy Spirit is the same God in his spiritual operations, "the Lord is that Spirit;"* and that the character of Christ Jesus, as the Son of God, is not a character independent of the human nature in which he was "God manifest in the flesh."

They reject the doctrine of original sin as commonly understood, while they admit that children are born into the world destitute of the original perfection of human nature. But they deny that the sin of Adam brings guilt upon the conscience, or infuses a moral pravity, which necessarily leads them to acts of personal transgression, believing that the final condemnation of the wicked will be the effect of their own personal sin, altogether independently of the sin of Adam.

They believe in the eternal happiness of all children who die

* 2 Cor. iii. 17.

before they are capable of understanding the evil of sin, and of all adults who have passed their whole lives in such a state of mental imbecility as to have been incapable of discriminating between good and evil.

They believe that the threatening of death to Adam, in the event of his violation of the divine command, had respect to his whole person; that the whole human race would have remained under the power of death, had not God interposed by his promise of the Seed of the woman to bruise the serpent's head; that by Christ, the second Adam, the free gift might come "upon all men unto justification of life;" that the everlasting existence of the human race is through the resurrection of Christ, and consequently that the soul of man is *not* naturally immortal.

They believe in particular, unconditional election; that God chose his people in Christ before the foundation of the world, irrespective of sin or other contingency, and that God would have manifested himself in the human nature had sin never had a being; but in consequence of the introduction of sin, Christ appeared in a suffering state, and gave himself for the redemption of the church, and also "a ransom for all."* Therefore salvation is proclaimed to the whole human race, in the most comprehensive acceptation of these words. To the same extent, they believe that God wills the salvation of all men, and that the gospel is to be "preached to every creature which is under heaven,"† by which preaching all men are called to repent and believe the gospel.

They believe that salvation is by grace alone, through faith, but that the grace of God in the soul is inseparable from holiness of life and conversation; that the gospel gives unto them which receive it in truth, the full assurance of hope in eternal salvation; that every believer knows he is a child of God,‡ and that therefore *doubt* is inconsistent with such assurance.

They believe that Christ shall reign by the power of his gospel, during the last thousand years of the earth's existence in its present state; and that afterwards, the heavens and the earth which now are, will be destroyed by fire, and then made anew, when all the saints, in a state of resurrection from the dead, will reign with Christ upon the new earth a thousand years, and that after the thousand years are expired, the resurrection of the wicked and the final judgment of the world will take place.

* 1 Tim. ii. 6. † Col. i. 23. ‡ 1 John v. 20.

They believe that it is the bounden duty of all the followers of Christ to be subject to the reigning powers, without regard to any particular line of politics; and to refrain from joining with any to overturn existing establishments.

Gentlemen, I have but discharged my duty, in commenting with great freedom upon the tenets of the Plaintiffs, and upon the evidence which they have adduced; and having proved their total inability to establish their claim, I shall now proceed to show that the cause which we espouse is the cause of the "truth of Christ," the cause of all the people of God; and that the foundation upon which we are established is that "of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone."*

As the doctrines and practices of our opponents are the very reverse of ours, I hold that it is impossible, in the very nature of things, that both can be standing on the one only sure foundation; or that both can have a claim to the bequest. As there is but "one body and one Spirit; one Lord, one faith, one baptism," one or other of us must be standing "in slippery places."

We know, gentlemen, that there are two states, and two only, for those who have sinned; in one or other of these states all are now, and all will at the day of judgment be.† These two states are separated by a broad and obvious line of demarcation here,‡ and by an impassable gulph hereafter.§ It therefore requires the deepest searching of heart and life, and the most scrutinizing examination of our respective claims, in order to ascertain, beyond the possibility of doubt, that we are now standing on the safe side, and that, at the great gathering of all nations, we shall stand among the "sheep," at the right hand of the Son of God.‖

I am aware, gentlemen, that I am defending what is in the present day regarded as a most unpopular cause; but I am also well aware that the time is approaching when that cause shall triumph over every other, and will reign unobstructed over the whole earth.¶ I am not disheartened by present contentions, but emboldened by bright and glorious prospects for the future undauntedly to assert, that I make faith,—*i. e.*, faith in the true and proper sense of the word, that "which worketh by love," which is the reliance of the mind in connexion with the judgment, and which is in the first place manifested in the ordinance of baptism,—A SINE QUA NON of chris-

* Eph. ii. 20. † Matt. xxv. 33. ‡ Mark xvi. 16; John iii. 5.
§ Luke xvi. 26. ‖ Matt. xxv. 32. ¶ Mal. i. 11.

tianity; while I assert with equal confidence, that no one, let his profession or character be what it may, is scripturally entitled to the name of christian, until, after the same manner, he has been baptized.

There are few persons, even among those with whom I am connected, who attach such vital importance to the momentous ordinance as I do. Yet the Plaintiffs even cannot consistently differ from me; although they, as you have previously heard, to keep up the appearance of charity, are occasionally constrained to admit that unchristened infants may be saved. But by having their children christened, they imply, nay they assert, that christening is essential to their salvation; more especially those of the Church of England, in whose Baptismal Service we read as follows: "Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour Christ saith none can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerate and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost; I beseech you to call upon God, the Father, &c., that he will grant to this child that thing which by nature he cannot have; that he may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and be made a *lively member* of the same."

And what do her acknowledged members, her ordained clergy, assert—those who are of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge throughout every parish in England? Why, "that a child, until it is baptized, remains in a heathen state, is not a member of the Church of Christ, has no part in the blessings purchased for us by him, is not a partaker in the privileges and hopes of the gospel, nor an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven."

Even MY LEARNED FRIEND, quoting the *judicious* Hooker, says that "if Christ himself, which giveth salvation, do require baptism, it is not for us who look for salvation to sound and examine him whether *unbaptized men may be saved*, but seriously to do that which is required, and religiously to fear the danger which may grow by the want thereof."

Three of his Witnesses also, in addition to subscribing the rubrics, assert as follows:—

The SECOND, that "all that are engrafted into Christ by faith, whereof baptism is a seal, are saved; whilst the unbelieving and unbaptized perish."

The THIRD, that "we are born anew in baptism, and in baptism exclusively."

The Fourth, that "Christ is the true ark; his church is within the ark, and is therefore safe; but all without will be swept with the besom of destruction. Into this ark men enter by faith. This faith Jews and Gentiles professed, when by baptism they were admitted into the Christian Church; and thus the baptismal water formed as it were the sign of their safety."

And what do the acknowledged Witnesses of the other part of the Plaintiffs assert? Why, the First, that "when John came baptizing with water, he gave the Jews the plainest intimations that this would not suffice; that it was only typical of that baptism of the Holy Ghost which they must all receive from Jesus Christ.... Those that have never had any other baptism than that of water, may take Jesus Christ's word for it, they cannot, in their present state, enter the kingdom of God."

The Fifth, that "he who understandeth the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, will never enter into the visible or invisible kingdom of God. As he refuses to become a member of the visible, he will certainly be shut out of the invisible kingdom. Baptism is here* made by Christ a condition absolutely necessary to an authorised entrance into the visible church."

The Sixth, that this "doctrine of original corruption, of which infant baptism is a standing, practical recognition, is one of fundamental importance. It teaches very simply, but very significantly, that even from the womb children are the subjects of pollution, and that they stand in need of a participation in the pardon of original apostacy, and of purification from the inherent depravity of their nature, in order to their entering heaven and seeing God."

The Seventh, that "without baptism as the sign of the covenant, we are taught that no one can enter into the kingdom, or enjoy the salvation of God."

The Eighth, that "infants are capable of being born again of water, or baptized, because else they could not enter into his kingdom, into which our Lord here† expressly declares they *do enter* and are admitted."

The Ninth, that "baptism is the outward sign of our entrance into God's covenant of mercy, and that when it is an act of true faith, it becomes an instrument of salvation, like that act of faith in Noah, by which he survived the destruction of an unbelieving world."

Gentlemen, I bring before you this summary of evidence, solely

* John iii. 5. † John iii. 5.

with a view to stop the future cavilling of the Plaintiffs, and not in anywise to strengthen my own argument. For if there was not another individual in the world who entertained the same views of the scriptures as I do, that circumstance would neither darken my prospects, nor abate my confidence. My opinions are not gathered from the teachings or writings of men, but from a diligent, deliberate, and careful searching of the Will. I must, therefore, either retain them, or renounce the authority of the scriptures; there is no other alternative.

The first account we have of the institution of baptism is in Matt. third chapter: "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea, and saying, Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand....Then went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, &c., and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." The same circumstance is recorded in the third of Luke: "The word of God came unto John ... in the wilderness: and he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."* That this is the first time that baptism is mentioned in the scriptures, as an *initiatory* into the church, is manifest, 1, from the appellation given to John, who is emphatically called *the* Baptist: 2, from the question which was put to John, "Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not the Christ?" and, 3, from John's own testimony, respecting himself and the object of his mission, "that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come, baptizing with water."†

I shall therefore proceed, gentlemen, to illustrate each of these propositions.

1. If baptism, in the sense before mentioned, had been an ordinance common among the Jews upon receiving converts, as some of the Witnesses assert that it was, it is difficult to conceive why John should have received a denomination so different from all who preceded him, as to be called THE Baptist. Then every priest who had received a convert would have been equally entitled to the appellation. Moreover, if it had been a thing to which the Jews had been accustomed, the observance of it would have excited no surprise, led to no enquiry. Even now, there is a people who are thus particularly denominated; and the reason is obvious: they have forsaken the path which has been, and still is, trodden by the church of Rome, and by all her descendants: while our opponents unequi-

* See also Mark i. 3, 4. † John i. 31.

vocally denote, by assuming to themselves the designation of Pedobaptists, that they have no claim to the distinctive title of Baptists. In order therefore to evade the acknowledgment of our title, they denominate us Antipedobaptists; but even this title sufficiently indicates that we are, what they are not, the disciples of John, and of John's Lord. Hence genuine Baptists are a distinct people; and, according to the command given to the Jews of old, they ought to dwell alone, and not be reckoned among the nations.* Our opponents, gentlemen, as you have heard, sometimes call us, by way of reproach, "dippers," and even "duckers;" while the more violent of them, outside these walls, occasionally class us with Socinians, Jews, infidels, ranters, &c. If it were not, then, for the manifest distinction between sprinkling a child and baptizing a believer, neither the term Baptist, applied to us, nor that which our opponents assume, to distinguish themselves from us,—and which is, like their professions, unscriptural,—would be required.

2. The question, Why baptizest thou, then? proposed to John by the Pharisees, at once shows that the institution was a new one. And it was this circumstance, doubtless, which led the Jews further to enquire of John who he was. Art thou the Christ? No. Art thou Elias? No. Why baptizest thou, then? Why dost thou introduce a new institution among us? That the Jews were expecting the immediate appearance of the great prophet whom Moses foretold,† is obvious from their conduct; while our Lord's question to the priests further corroborates the fact. "The baptism of John, (he asked,) whence was it, from heaven or of men?" The question nonplussed them. They were aware that all held John as a prophet; that the people came to his baptism as to an institution of God; and that if they denied it, they would be in danger from the people: while, on the other hand, they were equally aware that, if they confessed it, he would say, "Why did ye not then believe in him?"‡ They therefore evaded the question by a falsehood, saying, "We cannot tell."

3. John's testimony of himself; "That he (Christ) should be made manifest to Israel; therefore (he said) am I come, baptizing with water." John chose the neighbourhood of Jordan for the place of his ministry, on account of the convenience it afforded for the administration of the ordinance, declaring that he baptized with

* Numbers xxiii. 9; see John xviii. 36. † Luke iii. 15; Acts iii. 22.
‡ Matt. xxi. 25.

water unto repentance," but that he who should come after him should "baptize with the Holy Ghost, and with fire," of which John's baptism was the precursor. This is confirmed by our Lord's own testimony.* We have also another proof of its being a new institution, in that "all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John."† Had this baptism been practised by the fathers, it could not have been attributed to John. And again; Paul, in his address to the Jews, said, "When John had *first* preached before his coming the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel;"‡ and also Peter, in his address to Cornelius and his house, "That word, I say, ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, *after the baptism which John preached.*"§

Such passages of scripture as these, gentlemen, confute all the things gathered from the fragments of ancient writers and heathen authorities, which our opponents bring forward to prove that baptism is not a christian institution.

When the Testator was baptized by John, "a voice from heaven" declared, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."‖ Thus was John's baptism sanctioned by the Most High. And it was this same baptism,—the baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins,—which the Testator commissioned the disciples to preach;¶ and from their uniform practice, we are scripturally authorised to assert, that by the same baptism ALL who, under the guidance of the Spirit, receive "the truth," and believe to the "saving of the soul," will glorify God. Nor could any unbiassed individual, who had never heard the evidence of such men as the Plaintiffs' Witnesses, come to any other conclusion, or believe, in the absence of the testimony they furnish, that men who profess to reverence the authority of the Testator could so violate his command, and not only treat his ordinance with contempt, but teach others to contemn it also.

It is declared in the Will, that the Lord Jesus himself, before he took upon him the public ministry, came "from Galilee to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now; for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him."**

* See Acts i. 5. † Luke vii. 29. ‡ Acts xiii. 24. § Acts x. 37.
‖ Matt. iii. 17. ¶ Acts ii. 38. ** Matt. iii. 13—15.

How then, gentlemen, can our opponents treat that as a revival of an old rite, "A TRIFLING MATTER," "A THING OF INDIFFERENCE," "A NON-ESSENTIAL," the importance of which the Testator established by his own observance of it. John was convinced, by the Saviour's remark, that baptism was an ordinance essential, even to the Saviour himself; not that he had any sins to be forgiven, for he was perfection personified, but before he could become the ordained leader of his people.* Consequently, none can be reckoned among his people, until they have been, as he was, baptized by the baptism of John. And yet this ordinance is despised; and not only is it declared to be unnecessary, but we are told, that to attend to it is a superstitious act.

Here, gentlemen, I shall first briefly state the provisions of the Will, and describe the characteristics of the true heirs; and then I shall enquire into the proceedings of the acknowledged successors of our Lord, the men who observed and taught everything which he commanded them.

The commission given by the great Testator to his apostles, to whom "he expounded all things,"† is summed up in these few words: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you." To which he added the encouraging assurance of his abiding Spirit: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."

This commission, gentlemen, it must be remembered, was the last instruction the Testator gave to his apostles; and being the last, their recorded "ACTS" plainly show that they regarded it as most impressive and most momentous, and the observance of it a matter of the greatest consequence. They were to preach the gospel to every creature, with the comforting declaration, that "he that believeth, *and* is baptized, shall be saved." In the commission, we find the two words, "teach," and "teaching." The former, I presume, relates to instruction in first principles;‡ that the heart may be opened of God, preparatory to the individual's induction into the church; the manner of which induction is clearly taught, both by precept and example, in the Acts of the Apostles, and has always either direct or implied reference to the commission. Of this we have satisfactory evidence in the signs that followed,§ being in

* See Acts x. 42. † Mark iv. 34. ‡ Heb. vi. 1.
§ Acts xix. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 1—10.

accordance with Mark xvi. 17, the latter "teaching them to observe all things," &c, "for the perfecting of the saints, (those who had been previously so inducted,) for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."* Ample instructions for that purpose are also given in the Epistles, all of which, if we except that to James, are addressed either to particular churches, or bodies of saints, or to individual believers. Thus, then, we see, from what is related of them in the Acts, that the apostles, and the other disciples, acted in conformity with the Lord's commission; and that what they taught in their Epistles was only carrying out the commission to perfection.† There can, therefore, be no other way of salvation, but that which it specifies, "He that believeth," &c. As Paul says to the Galatians,‡ "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Unbelief, gentlemen, is the "gulph" which separates the sinner from baptism; and until he is enabled to pass that gulph, and to be baptized in faith, he is exposed to the denunciation which the Testator pronounced on all unbelievers, "He that believeth not shall be damned."

Thus we have the substance of what the Will requires, and the true heirs are those who subscribe to all its requisitions; who turn not from them, to the right hand or to the left;§ who "follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth;" as the scripture says, "The highway of the upright is to depart from evil. He that keepeth his way preserveth his soul."‖

It is manifest, then, according to the Will, that before we can lay any claim to its bequests, we must arrive at an age capable of understanding and receiving the heavenly message; we must be of a teachable disposition, like young children, beginning with first rudiments of Divine truth and doctrine, and proceeding by little and little, until, by prayer and supplication, and the teaching of the Holy Spirit, we attain to the knowledge of the first principles of the doctrine of Christ, as they are inculcated in the gospel. We are then to make an open confession of sin,¶ a profession of faith that Jesus Christ is the Son of God;** and then, going down into the water in the presence of the world, there put the seal to our confession and profession, by being "baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." As it is expressed,††

* Eph. iv. 12. † Heb. vi. 1; Matt. xxviii. 20. ‡ Gal. iii. 26, 27.
§ Josh. i. 7. ‖ Prov. xvi. 17. ¶ Matt. iii. 6.
** Acts viii. 37. †† Rom. x. 10.

"with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Thus we pass through the strait gate that leads to our heavenly inheritance; and hence, so certainly as the gospel of Christ "is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth,"* so certainly do the Plaintiffs, by christening a babe, take at the very beginning a false step.

That faith must precede baptism, and that, to make faith available, it must be succeeded by baptism, is shown by the proceedings of the disciples. Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you. ... Then they that gladly received his word were baptized."† Again, "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women."‡ "And Crispus... believed on the Lord, with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized."§ Again, Philip said to the Eunuch, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest; and the eunuch said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And Philip baptized him."

Then we read, that Peter, as soon as he perceived that the Holy Ghost had fallen upon Cornelius and his friends, commanded them to be baptized.‖ Then of Paul baptizing Lydia, whose heart the Lord had previously opened. Then of his baptizing the jailor and all his house.¶ And lastly, we read of him saying to certain individuals at Ephesus, "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."**

Hence we perceive the nature of the Testator's commission, and how it was understood and practised by his immediate followers. And having settled these points, I shall next adduce those passages of scripture which mention where and how baptism was administered, being confidently assured, that even those who may have been previously ignorant of the English signification of the verb baptize, will be at no loss to understand its literal meaning.

"And were baptized of him *in* Jordan."††

"And there went out to him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him *in* the *river of Jordan*."‡‡

* Rom. i. 16.
† Acts ii. 38. 41.
‡ Acts viii. 12.
§ Acts xviii. 8.
‖ Acts x. 47, 48.
¶ Acts xvi.
** Acts xix. 4, 5.
†† Matt. iii. 6.
‡‡ Mark i. 5.

"Jesus was baptized of John *in* Jordan."*

"Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway *out of the water*."†

"And John also was baptizing in Ænon, because there was *much water there*."‡

"And they *went down both into* the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him; and when they were *come up out of* the water," &c.§

Gentlemen, can any man of common understanding,—and to such the scriptures are more particularly addressed,—taking the connexion of the words in these passages with the attendant circumstances, put any other construction upon them than that the individuals thus stated to have been baptized were plunged under water? Is it in the nature of things to conceive that the passages quoted mean no more than that the baptizer, in each of these instances, merely *dipped his fingers* in the water, and sprinkled a few drops on the faces of the persons baptized? That the construction cannot be questioned, nor the conception admitted, must be the invariable conviction of every man who will examine the subject with an impartial eye. Truth, gentlemen, bears examination. "She has nothing to fear from investigation. She dreads not the light of science, nor shuns the scrutiny of the most prying inquiry. Conscious of innocence and purity, she challenges the fullest, the ablest, and the closest examination. Error, on the other hand, as if aware of her flimsy pretensions, and the transparent vail with which she attempts to conceal her deformity, flies from the true light and from impartial inquiry. She hides herself in the fastnesses of remote antiquity, and garrisons herself in the fortifications erected by those she honours with the title of 'the fathers.' Where she presides, (which she generally does,) in the temples of human resort, she attires herself in the attractions of popular applause, and piques herself upon the number, influence, and respectability of her admirers. But with all her blandishments she is an impudent harlot, and doomed with all her worshippers to destruction. But truth, immortal truth, the first-born of heaven, by the indisputable right of primogeniture, shall inherit all things, and leave her antagonist error exposed to universal shame and eternal punishment."

Gentlemen, I have now proved to you, from the Will, that no individual can be scripturally baptized before he believes; that when

* Mark i. 9. † Matt. iii. 16. ‡ John iii. 23. § Acts viii. 38, 39.

he believes, he is taught and directed to profess his faith in the ordinance of baptism; that the ordinance cannot be scripturally administered otherwise than by the immersion of the whole body in water; and that to baptize any individual who has not a capacity to comprehend, or who, having that capacity, is nevertheless destitute of faith, the previous qualification, or to substitute any application of water other than that of entire immersion, is a departure from the Will, and a contemptuous violation of the command of the Testator. And although we are now under a dispensation the characteristics of which are long-suffering, mercy, peace, and good-will towards men, nevertheless we are assured that those who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ will assuredly perish.* We must be careful, then, how we magnify the mercy of God at the expense of his justice and judgment.†

We will next enquire, gentlemen, into the design of the ordinance, what it is, and what instruction the Holy Spirit conveys by its administration?

Baptism is designed to be the criterion of a man's christianity, the proof of the reality of his faith; as by it the believer makes an open confession of Christ,‡ testifies of the truth that is in him,§ and declares by this shadow that he believes in the substance thereby represented.‖ Baptism "is being overwhelmed in water, representing the deep sorrows and sufferings of the Lord.¶ It is sinking into, being covered by, and coming up out of the water, as representing the death, burial, and resurrection of the Lord; as also the believer's dying, being buried, and rising again with him to "walk in newness of life."** It is the covering of the whole body with water, figuratively to show the washing away of all sin.†† It is the passing through the water, to show the passing from death to life; the passing out of darkness into light; the being "translated into the kingdom of God's dear Son."‡‡ It is being overflowed with water, to shadow forth the abundant overflowing of the promised Spirit.§§ In short, it is typical of all that the Holy Spirit has done for us, and of all that we are through him.‖‖

"Thus (gentlemen,) the ordinance of baptism, although it is only an outward sign, is a most holy appointment of the Lord, being a

* 2 Thess. i. 8. † Psalm lxxxix. 14. ‡ Rom. x. 10. § 3 John 3.
‖ 1 Peter iii. 21. ¶ Psalm xlii. 7. ** Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12.
†† Acts xxii. 16. ‡‡ John v. 24; Col. i. 13; 1 Peter ii. 9.
§§ John vii. 38, 39. ‖‖ Rom. iv. 25; 1 Cor. i. 30.

representation of things most great, most excellent, most glorious; displaying the fullness of the Testator in so felicitous and lively a manner as must be peculiarly interesting to every believer. It can only be attended to in due order by putting the believer under water; nothing else can in the true sense of the word be considered baptism. For no other way of using water can be figurative of the objects represented by it. The pouring down of the Holy Spirit is called baptism, not in allusion to the manner in which it is said to have been imparted, but to the plenitude in which the immediate disciples of Christ enjoyed its gifts and influences, insomuch that the minds of those on whom it descended were as fully enveloped in the glorious manifestation of his power, as their bodies had been previously enveloped in the element of water." Hence it is said by the Baptist, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance, but he that cometh after me is mightier than I; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost. Such, gentlemen, is the figurative use so repeatedly made in the Will of the word baptize.

I am persuaded, gentlemen, that you will agree with me, that so momentous an ordinance, instituted by God, and established by his well-beloved Son for an everlasting covenant, must be intended to answer a most important purpose—to set forth explicitly, and in a manner adapted to our understandings, the blessings which he now graciously communicates, and which he has still in reserve for his followers. Nor will you hesitate to admit that the view we have taken of baptism as a figurative ordinance, is plainly deducible from the Will, without in anywise straining the sense by imaginary conjectures. This, then, independently of any other proof, is sufficient to show the folly, the sinfulness, and the impiety of that carnal rite—Infant Sprinkling, or sprinkling or effusing in any case, because it is not, as baptism is, a figure of those glorious things we have before mentioned.

It is possible, gentlemen, notwithstanding the number of examples I have adduced of the Lord's jealousy of his institutions, that I shall still be accused of attaching too much weight to baptism. But I have yet to learn how it is possible to attach too much weight to that ordinance of which the Saviour of man said, at the edge of the water, previous to going down into it, "Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness;" an ordinance which, in every instance except two, preceded the gift of the Holy Spirit; while in those two instances it immediately succeeded to it. Besides, we are told that "if any

any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his."* It must also be remembered that these two are the only instances upon record where there was an open manifestation of the Spirit anterior to baptism. Even in the instance of the spotless Testator himself, the Spirit did not descend upon him until he was coming up out of the water. And I see not how those can expect to be baptized with the Spirit, and be one with the Testator, who reject the counsel of God against themselves, by refusing to be baptized with the baptism of John.†

I have heard it said that "it is quite as possible to idolize a divine institution, as it was for the Israelites to worship the brazen serpent" But if to defend and enforce an institution of God, established by his well-beloved Son,—an institution the observance of which was the last, and consequently the most momentous, command which he gave to his disciples, at the end of the forty days he was with them after his resurrection,—a command which they were permanently to observe,—if this be to idolize the Divine institution of Baptism, we must plead guilty to the charge. But to do otherwise, would be to preach "another Jesus," whom Paul has "not preached."‡

Again; some may say that I *limit* the Almighty. This I deny. I do no more than state what I find plainly written in his word. If there is a limitation there, the limitation is of God. In the clearest manner He has revealed his mind, both as it relates to the salvation of man, and the manner in which that salvation shall be bestowed. And if an individual, refusing to profit by it, die as an offender, the fault is his own; and his Creator is just in leaving him to the consequences of his own devices. In what way, then, it may be asked, is the sinner brought to experience salvation? The Son of God answers the question, and shews that it is by believing, and being baptized.§ This, according to the Will, is the only way by which salvation can be enjoyed. And if men disregard their eternal welfare, until, from sickness or age, they are incapacitated to search the scriptures, and "come to the knowledge of the truth,"‖ thus losing the opportunity of learning and professing Christ in the appointed manner, they are themselves responsible for their neglect.¶ Their neglect is therefore no proof of any limitation, either of the goodness or mercy of God, "who will have all men to be saved." But then it must be after his own manner only; as it is written,

* Rom. viii. 9. † Luke vii. 29, 30. ‡ 2 Cor. xi. 4.
§ Mark xvi. 16. ‖ 1 Tim. ii. 4. ¶ See Prov. i. 23. 31.

"that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest."*

A simple illustration will make this obvious. A commander of an army, when instances of desertion occur, is sometimes induced to issue a proclamation to this effect, that whosoever will return to his duty shall be reinstated in his former position, without a question being asked, or his crime noticed. Some, believing the commander means what he says, return; others, who either do not believe him, or dislike him, delay their return. But they are apprehended, and what is the consequence? They are shot! Will any reasonable person, then, assert that the cause of their being shot was the want of fulness or freeness in the commander's proclamation?

But some persons say, "there is no positive command in scripture, —no enforcement of the gospel message, nor obligation on the part of the people to receive it." It may be replied, Why should there be? If the objectors had a large estate left them, would they refuse it, because the testator had taken no means to enforce its acceptance? No! On what grounds, then, do they suppose the Donor of the heavenly inheritance ought to have acted otherwise, in bequeathing an inheritance to which the whole world bears no comparison? He has exhorted and persuaded them, in every possible way, to accept it;† he has reproved and denounced those that will not.‡ What more could the most unreasonable require? But God "now commandeth all men everywhere to repent, because he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained."§

Again, I may be thought uncharitable in entertaining an unfavorable opinion as to the future happiness of those who have departed without making a profession of faith. But, gentlemen, I should be much more uncharitable, and much more obnoxious to blame, if I did not warn the living, as the rich man was desirious that his brethren should be warned,‖ of the fatal consequences of procrastination; if I did not exhort them to avoid putting far "away the evil day,¶ lest they also should depart in like manner; and thus be summoned unprepared to that awful tribunal from which there is no appeal. My arguments cannot in anywise affect the state of the dead; but they may be a means of preventing some one or other

* Psalm li. 4. † See Psalm lxxviii. 1—8; Matt. xi. 28; John v. 39, 40.
‡ Prov. i. 23—32. § Acts xvii. 30, 31. ‖ See Luke xvi. 27—31.
¶ Amos vi. 3.

of the living from being seduced by the doctrines of men, and of arousing him from that carnal security which is the destruction of the majority of mankind.* I deem it far more scriptural and charitable to warn an individual that he is pursuing a wrong course, than either to let him proceed unheeded, or by soft words to foster a delusion that it might lead him to eternal happiness.†

Gentlemen, as I have before said, little or no reliance ought to be placed upon what are called death-bed professions; even if they be sincere, they are ineffectual, because the individuals had, when in health, refused the call of the Lord, and thus lost the opportunity of scripturally professing their faith.‡ Professions on a sick bed may generally be considered rather as extorted by fear, than as the fruits of genuine repentance; in numberless cases the mind is so weakened by the exhaustion of bodily strength, as to be incapable of reflecting on the past, or meditating on the future; and thus, in many instances, the individual, when free from pain, is softened down into a quiescent state of repose, so as to imagine that all around is joy and peace. This is mere delusion. In almost every instance of recovery, experience proves that men relapse into their former evil habits. "They cried unto the Lord in their trouble, and he saved them out of their distresses;"§ but "they soon forgat his works, they waited not for his counsel."|| There is nothing in the scriptures to encourage man to hope that in his best days he may seek after his own heart and his own eyes,¶ and yet be called when he is brought to the verge of the grave; on the contrary, its statement is, "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation."** A true and effectual profession of faith is made previous to, and by, baptism, when the heart is firm in the truth, and the individual in a composed, vigorous, and healthy state of mind; whether early in the morning, or at the eleventh hour.

There were doubtless some among the antediluvians who, after the windows of heaven had been opened, repented; and some even who might have attempted to enter the ark, but who, like the five foolish virgins, found the door shut; and that door, being once shut against any individual, must, notwithstanding all entreaties to the contrary, remain shut.†† These texts suggest a warning to every unbeliever, and should lead him to use all diligence, while the term of health and activity remains, (for this may expire at any moment,)

* See Zeph. i. 12. † See Lev. xix. 17. ‡ Prov. i. 25—28.
§ Psalm cvii. 13. || Psalm cvi. 13. ¶ See Num. xv. 39.
** 2 Cor. vi. 2; see also Prov. i. 24—32. †† Matt. xxv. 10—12; Luke xiii. 25—27.

to enter, while the door is open, into the ark—the church of God. They should also cause him to attend to the admonition of the Testator, "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh."* The prophet says, "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near."† The inference, then, to be drawn from this is, that there may come a time when he shall not be found; a time when he will not be near: the correctness of this inference is placed above all doubt by Prov. i. 24—32.

When a believer, who has given evidence of the sincerity of his faith, is about to depart this life, we are authorised by the Testator to say to him, as was said to Daniel, "Go thou thy way till the end be; for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days."‡ But we have no authority to address such language to him who has given no such evidence. "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus is come in the flesh is not of God."§ Since the decree went forth to preach the gospel to every creature, baptizing them, &c., we have NO instance recorded in the Will from whence we can infer, either directly or by implication, that any unbaptized person was "made meet to be a partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light."‖

Gentlemen, we are not to base our hope of salvation, or that of others, on detached passages of the Will, but on the broad basis of the whole. Paul speaks as follows: "Therefore, leaving the principles of the doctrine of Christ," or the word of the beginning of Christ, "let us go on unto perfection, not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God; of the doctrine of baptisms, (that of water and the Spirit,) and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment."¶ Thus he shows to us "the way of salvation," in directing us to the truths of the gospel in their due order. First repentance, then faith, then baptism, then laying on of hands, then the resurrection of the dead, and lastly eternal judgment. This, gentlemen, is not an association of essentials with non-essentials, by which latter term many are pleased to denominate every doctrine and divine institution which is not to their taste; but it is an epitome of truths, all of the first moment. Faith, being succeeded by baptism,

* Matt. xxv. 13. † Isa. lv. 6. ‡ Dan xii. 13.
§ 1 John iv. 2, 3. ‖ Col. i. 12. ¶ Heb. vi. 1, 2.

is the very foundation of that christianity which the apostle taught; that upon which all believers are now built, and constitute a holy temple of the Lord.

I do not know, gentlemen, by what means the good work can be "finished" in any in whom the foundation, according to the divine plan, has never been laid.* Paul besought Timothy to abide at Ephesus, that he might charge some that they *teach no other doctrine;*† and John, writing to the elect lady and her children, says, "This is love, that we walk after his commandments. This is the commandment, that, as ye have heard from the beginning, ye should walk in it....Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in *the doctrine of Christ*, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son."

Gentlemen, It is not "the preparation of a sovereign remedy that cures the disease, but the application of it. It is not from the defect of mercy in God, or salvation in Christ, that men perish, but for their own obstinate rejection of both—their perseverance in unbelief." It is essential to the salvation of man, that he should understand and receive the testimony of the Testator, as revealed in his Will; that he should, through that testimony, believe in him "to the saving of the soul;" and that he be obedient to all his commands. What these two principles, faith and obedience, are, I shall here briefly state. The believer, under their influence, comes to God, "believing that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him;"‡ he comes unto God by him (Christ,) "seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for" him;§ he looks for the teaching of his Spirit, to enable him to search the scriptures with his whole soul, in simplicity of heart; he takes God at his word, without gainsaying or questioning the sincerity of his declarations, when he declares that he will be found of us if we search for him.‖ He submits "to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king as supreme, or unto governors, as to them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well." He honors all men, loves the brotherhood, fears God, honors the king.¶ He renders "to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor,;" he owes "no man anything;"** he manifests his love to God by a filial reverence, and by a cheerful

* See Phil. i. 6. † 1 Tim. i. 3. ‡ Heb. xi. 6. § Heb. vii. 25.
‖ See Jer. xxix. 13, 14. ¶ 1 Peter ii. 13. 17. ** Rom. xiii. 7, 8.

and willing mind; not as a mere slavish act of duty, reluctantly yielded to a strict and severe master, but as a pleasing acquiescence in the will of a gracious Sovereign. He believes in the Testator as his Saviour; believes that he died for him personally, as well as for the world collectively; regards his atonement as all-sufficient for his salvation, independent of any works of his own; confesses his faith before many witnesses, with sincerity of heart, according as we are instructed in his holy will, and seals his confession by being publicly baptized in water. He delights to partake of the typical body and blood of the Lord, at his table, in remembrance and acknowledgment of the mighty sacrifice he made for our redemption; and ever after "walks worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called,"* observing all things whatsoever he has commanded us.† He is assured of his acceptance with Christ, that he is an heir of the eternal inheritance, according to the positive declaration and immutable promise of the Testator, "I go to prepare a place for you; and...I will come again and receive you unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also."‡ He believes that the followers of Christ are the antitypes of ancient Israel; enjoying light in their dwellings, while their opponents, the antitypes of the Egyptians, are in darkness, "even darkness which may be felt."§

This, gentlemen, according to our views, is the sum and substance of all that the Will requires of the legatees. Indeed it is impossible that the "Revelation of Jesus Christ" can be so ambiguous as the evidence of the Plaintiffs' Witnesses would lead you to believe. If it were, we should have nothing certain to guide us; but, like them, we should be "carried about with every wind of doctrine." "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"‖

Gentlemen, the Testator has said, "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven: but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."¶ As the words stand, not to confess him is tantamount to denying him;** I would therefore ask, with all humility, Could God, of whom it is said, "he will judge the world in righteousness, by that man whom he hath ordained,"†† "be just,"‡‡ if he were to justify those who

* Eph. iv. 1.
† Matt. xxviii. 20.
‡ John xiv. 2, 3.
§ Exod. x. 21—23.
‖ 1 Cor. xiv. 8.
¶ Matt. x. 32.
** See 1 John iv. 2, 3.
†† Acts xvii. 31.
‡‡ Rom. iii. 26.

had not, in a scriptural manner, confessed their belief in Jesus, who "became the author of eternal salvation unto *all that obey him*"?* If he could, then the act of the Father would be at variance with the declaration of the Son,† and "the promise made of none effect."‡

If the Lord, because he had previously pronounced sentence against the first offence, could not, consistently with his justice, forgive Adam, independently of the sacrifice of Christ, how, I would with reverence ask, can he, on the same principle, receive any one into the mansions of glory, independently of his coming to him by the way that Christ has, both by example and precept, pointed out?§ The promise of eternal life is not to those who simply believe, but to those who believe and confess their faith by being baptized.‖ By the law of England, an unsigned document is invalid. If hundreds of persons were conversant with the manner in which an individual intended to bequeath his property, and even saw his will written out, yet, if the individual died previous to signing it, the intended legatees would have no claim. If man, then, submits to the requirements of a law made by his fellow man, I see not on what principle he can refuse to submit to a law made by his Saviour. In the one case, the intended legatees must submit to lose what they would have received, had the testator completed the document; in the other, the document is completed, but the legatees are too high minded, or too self-willed, to fulfil the requirement; or are careless, indolent, or undecided; and therefore forfeit the legacy. Again, as all men in this country are supposed, by one of its maxims, to know what the law is, and alleged ignorance will not, if they transgress, exempt them from punishment; so all men who have the scriptures in their hands, and can read them, will, if they transgress, and do not repent, be left without excuse, and subject to the punishment which the gospel denounces.

Seeing, then, that these things are so, the disobedient must, as a natural consequence, be condemned, and all the angels in heaven will testify to the justice of their sentence.¶ If men will not search the scriptures, that they may be enabled to "lay hold on eternal life," but will content themselves in "the chambers of their imagery,"** it will avail them nothing at the last day to say, "Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out

* Heb. v. 9. † Mark xvi. 16; John iii. 5. ‡ Rom. iv. 14.
§ See Matt iii. 13—17; Mark xvi. 15, 16. ‖ Matt. x. 32; Rom. x. 10.
¶ Matt. xxv. 31—40. ** Ezek. viii. 12.

devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works?" Nor ought they to be surprised, when they hear the dreadful words, "Depart from me, ye that work iniquity."*

Gentlemen, I can, of "sincerity, in the sight of God," say with the apostle of the Gentiles, that "my heart's desire and prayer to God" for our opponents "is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God."† Nor is it less my fervent wish and prayer, that the result of this trial may not only open the eyes of some of my countrymen to the delusive system now so prevalent, but that it may induce them to read the Will, and judge for themselves. Even a cursory view of it will convince them that there was no necessity for this trial; but that every man may be a judge of his own case, and know to a certainty whether he is or is not entitled to the bequest; for while he has the least misgiving, he may rest assured that his name is not in it.‡ And further, he will discover, that whosoever shall yield his whole mind to the instructions it affords, and "with purpose of heart... cleave to the Lord,"§ "praying to God alway," as Cornelius did, and observing "all things, whatsoever he has commanded," shall, by the Spirit of truth which shall dwell in him,‖ find all doubts and fears for ever banished from his conscience, and be self-convinced that his title to the heirship is unalienably established; as it is written, "that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life."¶

"Seeing, then, that we have such hope, we use great plainness and boldness of speech," as the apostle did.** This plainness and boldness may give pain to some, but it does not follow that such pain will be to all injurious. On the contrary, it may, and I hope will, through the blessing of the Lord, tend to stir them up, by putting them in remembrance that every individual, who is desirous of running in the christian race, must, by a general public profession, enter the list of the faithful, who have already been named for the contest; and that every one that thus commences the race, and

* Matt. vii. 22, 23. † Rom. x. 1—3.
‡ See what is said on the fearful and unbelieving, Rev. xxi. 8.
§ Acts xi. 23. ‖ John xiv. 17. ¶ Titus iii. 7.
** 2 Cor. iii. 12.

keeps within the prescribed bounds, striving with all his might to reach the goal, will certainly receive "the prize;"* while others, who have not so entered, however earnestly they may strive, keeping apparently within the course, and however, to the short-sighted, they may appear to take the lead, can never claim it; on the contrary, they will be put to shame, because they did not "strive lawfully."† It will therefore be the wisdom of those who are thus running to retrace their steps, while there is time, and to begin the race anew according to the appointed order; and for those who "are settled on their lees,"‡ to bestir themselves, and work while it is day,§ lest they have at length to utter the poignant exclamation, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved."‖

Before I conclude my defence, gentlemen, permit me to read, for your further satisfaction and government, a concise summary of texts; in order to point out to you the vast importance which is attached to the ordinance of baptism, as manifested throughout the Gospel, from the beginning of it even to the end of it.

John i. 6. "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John."

Mark i. 4, 5. And "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of *repentance for* the *remission* of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, *confessing* their sins."

Luke iii. 3. "And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

John i. 28, 29. 31. These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing. The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world!... And I knew him not: but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water."

Matt. iii. 13—17. Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it

* 1 Cor. ix. 24. † 2 Tim. ii. 5. ‡ Zeph. i. 12.
§ John ix. 4. ‖ Jer. viii. 20.

becometh US *to fulfil all righteousness.* Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Luke vii. 29, 30. And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him."

Luke xxiv. 46, 47. "Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem."

Mark xvi. 15, 16. "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth AND is baptized shall be saved; BUT he that believeth not shall be damned."

John iii. 5. "Except a man be born of water AND of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Acts. i. 5. "For John *truly* baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

Acts xix. 4. "John (said Paul) verily baptized with the baptism of repentance."

Acts ii. 37, 38. "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, *what shall we do?* Then said Peter unto them, *Repent* and be *baptized*, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, FOR *the remission of sins*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Acts viii. 12. 17. "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women... Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost."

Acts x. 47, 48. "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized."

Acts xxii. 10. 14. 16. "And I (Paul) said, *What shall I do, Lord?* And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus,

and there shall it be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do.... And he (Ananias) said, The God of our fathers hath chosen thee, that thou shouldest know his will, and see that Just One, and shouldest hear the voice of his mouth.... And now, why tarriest thou, *arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord."

Acts viii. 36—39. "And the eunuch said, See, here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him."

Acts xvi. 30, 31. 33. "And he (the jailer) said, Sirs, *what must I do to be saved?* And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.... And he was baptized, he and all his, straightway."

Rom. vi. 3, 4. 7. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life... For he that *is dead* is (justified or) *freed* from sin."

1 Cor. xii. 13. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and have been all made to drink of one spirit."

Gal. iii. 27—29. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ.... For ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Col. ii. 12, 13. "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses."

1 Peter iii. 21, 22. "The like figure whereunto, *even baptism, doth also now save us* (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ: who is gone into heaven, and is on the right

hand of God; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him."

Rev. xxii. 14. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."

Thus it is obvious, gentlemen, that the ordinance of baptism has been commanded, exemplified, and ratified, in a sufficient number of places to prove that it is essential to the forgiveness of sin, and, consequently, to salvation. Nor can the fact that it is not mentioned in every place where belief is mentioned, "make the commandment of none effect."

Finally, gentlemen, I submit it to you whether we are not, according to the texts just quoted, scripturally authorised to assert, that this momentous ordinance was intended to precede the remission of sins, the justification of the sinner, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and every privilege that is promised to the saint; and if it would not be well for all to take heed to the declaration of the great Testator, "Blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me."*

And now, gentlemen, I shall bring forward one Witness,—not to give evidence against the Plaintiffs, for in this matter their own Witnesses have anticipated him,—but to convince you that we have had our hearts opened of the Lord "to believe to the saving of the soul;"† and that we have, as is required by the Testator, confessed our faith in the ordinance of baptism. Thus we have entered "in through the gates into the city;"‡ and have "received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father, the Spirit itself bearing witness with our spirit that we are the children of God; and if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."§ The learned and upright judge will, in an impartial manner, point out to you in his charge all that he may deem requisite. For myself, I thank you for the patience with which you have listened to me; and leaving my Witness to speak for himself, I shall no longer detain you, resting satisfied that you will weigh the evidence on both sides with all the calmness and impartiality which the momentous subject requires. Now with "him that is able to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think,"‖ I leave our GLORIOUS CAUSE. I am

* Matt. xi. 6. † Heb. x. 39. ‡ Rev. xxii. 14.
§ Rom. viii. 15—17. ‖ Eph. iii. 20.

satisfied that your verdict will, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, show to every humble and enquiring mind, that we have proved from the Will, that which my learned friend so much dreaded we should prove, "that there is a system more efficient for bringing our fellow-creatures to God" than either he or his Witnesses have produced: and, consequently, that the Plaintiffs' "CAUSE IS GONE." This verdict, from the evidence which you have heard, and that which you are about to hear, I anticipate at your hands; "For their rock is not as our Rock, even our enemies themselves being judges."*

* Deuteronomy xxxii. 31.

WITNESS FOR THE DEFENDANTS.

I think myself happy, my Lord and Gentlemen of the Jury, because I have this day the honor of standing here, to give my evidence on the momentous things which are now the subjects of enquiry before you. Believing that I cannot better prove my gratitude to the Most High, for the innumerable mercies and the inestimable gifts which I have received at his hands, than by thus voluntarily coming forward to "be his witness" of the dignity and importance of his Divine Institution, to wipe away the reproach by which the enemies of truth have defamed it, and to display it in the brightness of its original purity. It is my hope also that I shall be able to make it manifest to this Court, that it is by the ordinance of baptism alone that the Testator will, previous to admittance into his church, have his name confessed by every believer who is willing, through evil report and good report, despite the sneers, the scoffs, and the censures of the world, to take his yoke upon him, and learn of him.* This I shall do with fervent charity and sincere "good-will towards all men;" "if by any means I may provoke to emulation them which are my flesh, and might save some of them."† It is my anxious desire thus to magnify, according to the ability God has given me, the honor and majesty of his glorious name. Being, however, a stranger to nearly all present, I shall follow the example of several of the Witnesses on the other side, and, before entering on a course by which I have been led to understand, and pay obedience to, the Will, shall submit to you the following brief account of myself:—

I was born in the year 1774. At an early age, and almost devoid of education, I determined on being a sailor; and therefore apprenticed myself to a ship-owner. This will be a sufficient apology for the plainness of my speech, the poverty of my eloquence, and for any lack of courteousness or of the art of persuasion. Still I am confident that the Court will not decry my statements, merely on account of my want of learning, more particularly when

* Matt. xi. 29. † Rom. xi. 14.

it is remembered, that the Will was in the first instance published through the witnessing and teaching of unlearned men.

The profession which I had chosen soon familiarised me with all the vices to which seamen were at that time addicted. The several masters with whom I sailed were men of the most profligate character, and both by their conversation and example, they encouraged every species of immorality, and thus poisoned the minds of all the youths who had the misfortune to sail with them.

While in the West Indies, I witnessed, at three different periods, —in St. Domingo, in Jamaica, and in Surinam,—the greater portion of our crew, together with the crews of the ships lying around us, swept off by the yellow fever; and twice was I brought to the verge of the grave by the same disease. Yet a thought of futurity never once crossed my mind; of me it might be said, that I literally lived "without Christ and without God in the world."

An occurrence which happened on a homeward passage, strikingly illustrates the thoughtless character of the seamen of former days. The master of the ship of which I was mate had been attacked with the yellow fever, as the officers and several of the crew had previously been. By the master of a ship of the same convoy under which we were then sailing, he was persuaded to quit his own vessel, and go on board that of his friend; to which he consented, leaving me in command, with a charge never to quit the deck, although at the time I was in such a weakly state, from the effects of the fever, as scarcely to be pronounced convalescent. The second mate was at the time confined to his cabin from the same cause; and there was no other person capable of taking charge of a watch. The carpenter being the next best seaman, one watch was of necessity confided to him. The number of the original crew was thinned by impressment and death, and the strength of the survivors so much reduced that it was with the greatest difficulty we could work the ship; indeed it would have been beyond our power, had the weather not been favourable. Just before the master left the ship, a boy died, and the corpse was very unceremoniously thrown over the bows, lest the master should, by knowing of the boy's death, be dispirited. A little while after he left the ship, a man died, and after the body had been sewed up in a hammock, I ordered it to be brought to the gangway, for the purpose of having the usual service read, that it might be committed to the deep with some appearance of decency. Something ludicrous occurring, which excited the mirth of those

who were carrying it, they burst out into a loud fit of laughter, and had nearly let the body fall. I felt that under such circumstances it would be mockery to read the service, and therefore told them to throw the body overboard, which was done with the utmost unconcern.

On nearing Liverpool, and immediately after the ship was boarded by a pilot, my fever returned with redoubled violence, and for several weeks after I landed, with some little intermission, my sufferings were excruciating. Three months passed over before I regained much strength, and as many years before I recovered my former health. The second mate escaped by a few days a watery grave, but only to find an earthly one. Yet my very narrow escape made not the least impression upon me; I never once returned thanks for it, nor ever reflected with gratitude on my recovery, which at one time was thought by my medical attendants to be almost beyond hope.

As soon as my health would permit, having obtained the command of a ship, I returned to Port-au-Prince, the same sickly place where my fever had originated; and after making a number of voyages to various places, I was, when on an homeward passage, taken by a French privateer, carried into Bordeaux, and thence marched off by a circuitous route, about six hundred miles, to Verdun, a place renowned for its vices; in fact, it was Paris in miniature. There I remained four years and a half; when, seeing no prospect of an exchange of prisoners, I resolved, regardless of consequences, to attempt my escape. In descending the ramparts of the citadel, where I had been confined, I fell from a height of from forty to fifty feet; but though much bruised and shaken by the fall, I, and three others who accompanied me, managed to get out of the *fosse*, and away from the fortress, though at a slow pace, principally owing to my stiffness, and one of the party having strained both ancles. On the eleventh night after our escape we were recaptured, brought back, thrust into a wretched hole, and had our hands and feet put in irons. After a close confinement of seven days, we were, in the middle of the night, aroused out of a sound sleep by four gendarmes, who hurried us off to Bitche, a strong fortress about eleven leagues from the Rhine. It is situated on the top of a lofty hill, the extreme height of some parts of its ramparts being about one hundred and fifty feet above the level of the fosse. From this place, also, some others and myself devised a way of escape; were taken a second time, and brought back, our hands being lacerated with the rope by which we

descended, and our feet pricked with thorns and swollen with cold. In this state we were put into a cell under ground, one side of which was a sheet of ice, and against this side the boards on which we slept were fastened. In a few days we made interest to get into the hospital. Thence, when partially recovered, a portion of us were removed to a dungeon, twenty to thirty feet under ground, the bottom of which was always over the shoe-tops in water. By further interest, we were removed from thence into a small detached strong tower, and had a sentinel placed over us. Still our spirits remained undaunted, and being in nowise cast down by former disasters and disappointments, we made, about eight weeks after our last capture, a third attempt to escape. Five of us safely landed in the ditch of the fort, after a descent from our prison-house of about a hundred and forty feet; but the sixth, dropping from an outwork, unfortunately broke his leg. In our perilous situation, we could do no other than leave him where he fell. This time we evaded the vigilance of our pursuers, crossed the Rhine a little below Strasburg, marched by highways and by-ways, through Baden, Wirtemburg, and Bavaria, which countries were then confederates with France. At Saltsburg, we obtained passports for Trieste, and, after a wearisome and fatiguing march of twenty-nine days, obtained the cheering sight of our native element. (For the particulars of my captivity, escapes, and some account of my early life, see "Prison Scenes," a work I have lately published, and which may be had of the publishers of this work, price 5s.) Finally, all of us reached home in safety, myself, after an absence of six years, five-and-a-quarter of which were passed in captivity, with a heart if possible harder and more insensible than when I took my departure.

After some time I went to Buenos Ayres, and settled there; but returned disappointed, after an absence of two years. Under more favourable circumstances, I again went there, and succeeded to my wishes. On my return home, I was drawing near to my fortieth year, without, until a very short time previously, having had one serious thought of the object of my being. In this respect my case was no uncommon one, at least so far as my own experience enables me to judge. Notwithstanding this, like the majority of my countrymen, I was a member of the Church of England, having as report stated been christened; consequently, according to the dogma of that church, I was a "member of Christ, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven;" a church which is affirmed by

many of her members, — men whom the world distinguishes for zeal, learning, and piety, to be framed after the pure and primitive rule of the apostles.

How far the life I led justified such dogmas, I leave those to determine who hold and inculcate them. I leave them also to say if they do not tend more to the destruction of man, than if he had been left, as he was born, "like a wild ass's colt."*

With me the Lord dealt most mercifully, not rewarding me according to mine iniquities, but sparing my life; not only giving me space for repentance, but inclining my heart to it; while many of my companions, who were not a whit more thoughtless or abandoned than myself, were cut off in the midst of their sins.

I now come to that part of my life when, for the first time, a serious thought darted across my mind. I awoke as from a dream, and asked myself the question, "To what purpose have I been living, and what will be the result of the course I am pursuing?" Nothing particular occurred at the time to arouse my dormant spirit; the work appeared spontaneous, effected independent of any apparent cause; but without doubt it was influenced by a power beyond myself, even by the Spirit of God, whose revealed promises and threatenings I had hitherto disregarded. The enquiry which resulted led to the discovery that I was destitute of every thing that could confer true and abiding happiness; and though I cannot say that the discovery caused me any immediate poignancy of feeling, yet I never afterward lost sight of my dangerous state.

Shortly after my mind had been thus impressed, I arrived at home, and married. Then I deemed it requisite, according to custom, to attend some place of worship, but I had no discriminating judgment to direct my choice. In my early days I had been in the habit of attending the Established Church with my father, who was a member of it, and who, I have been informed, had me christened. Who my sponsors were, I do not know; but this I know, that they made a false profession when they renounced, in my name, the devil and all his works, and that they neglected their duty when they promised to "call upon me to hear sermons." This they never did; but I was taught by somebody the catechism, "the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments in the vulgar tongue." As I became more my own master, the partiality for my mother induced me for a time to accompany her to a small Baptist chapel, of which she was

* Job xi. 12.

a worthy member. The late John Johnson was the pastor, whose writings, rich in their illustrations of scripture, are likely to perpetuate his name, until "all shall know the Lord, from the least unto the greatest."* Afterwards, between my voyages, I attended with a congregation of particular Baptists, merely because I liked their society better. But when I settled, so far as I can account for my own movements, old associations, as much as any other thing, led me again among my mother's connexion. This connexion has ever been to me a source of rejoicing and thankfulness; for I can assert, without fear of contradiction, that as a body, they are more familiar with the scriptures than any other body of people with whom I am acquainted, or of whom I have read. Being, as I have before stated, already faintly impressed with the importance of salvation, and having my mind directed by the minister to the plain and simple testimony of the Testator and his apostles, I began to search the Will for myself, with prayer and supplication for the illumination of the Spirit, to "guide me into all truth." Beyond seeing something of the nature of baptism, I had not imbibed the dogma of any sect, which, as I had nothing to unlearn, was a great advantage to me.

In the Will, I clearly saw that Christ is the "propitiation for the sins of whole world,"† and that the grace of God is freely extended to every sinner who is sincerely desirous of possessing it. I saw also that individually I was, by the following texts, as particularly invited to partake of its blessings, as if there had not been another individual on earth. "Let him take hold of my strength, that he may make peace with me, and he shall make peace with me."‡ "Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened."§ "All things whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive."‖ "Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink."¶ "And the Spirit and the bride say, Come; and let him that heareth say, Come; and let him that is athirst come; and whosoever will, let him take of the water of life freely."** "Him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out."†† I saw that although I had destroyed myself, the imagination of my heart having

* Heb. viii. 11. † 1 John ii. 2. ‡ Isa. xxvii. 5.
§ Matt. vii. 7, 8. ‖ Matt. xxi. 22. ¶ John vii. 37.
** Rev. xxii. 17. †† John vi. 37.

been evil from my youth,* yet that I was not only encouraged to take hold of his strength, but that words were put into my mouth whereby to address him; and this too, followed with the most gracious promises: "Take with you words, and turn to the Lord; say unto him, Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously."† "Ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls."‡ I saw, further, that I was addressed in the most gracious and condescending manner: "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord; though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool."§ "Ye shall seek me and find me, when ye shall search for me with all your heart."‖ "Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest for your souls."¶

Notwithstanding that I felt assured I was included in these kind and encouraging declarations and promises, I did not wholly and heartily embrace them. Although I was disposed to put my hand to the plough, there was still a looking back. While I was in this state, halting between two opinions, I met with an accident, which might not only have deprived me of this life, but also of that which is to come. Sitting, one evening, in the dark, upon one end of a swing bridge, leading over the Wigan canal, and which was off at the time, a flat passing through struck the opposite end, and knocked me with great violence backward. My head came in contact with the stone-work below, from whence I fell into the water. I received a very severe concussion, but had sufficient presence of mind to extricate myself; yet the concussion deranged my faculties for several hours after. This narrow escape opened my eyes to the folly and danger of procrastination, and recalled to my mind, in all their force, the following passages of scripture: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave."** "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation."†† I saw "life and good, and death and evil, set before me,"‡‡ and I sought the Lord with greater fervency. He enabled me to embrace the blessing "which he hath promised to them that love

* Gen. viii. 21. † Hos. xiv. 2. ‡ Jer. vi. 16.
§ Isa. i. 18. ‖ Jer. xxix. 13. ¶ Matt. xi. 28, 29.
** Eccl. ix. 10. †† 2 Cor. vi. 2. ‡‡ Deut. xxx. 15.

him."* "What," then I asked myself, "shall I render to the Lord for all his benefits towards me? I will take the cup of salvation, and call upon the name of the Lord; I will pay my vows unto the Lord now, in the presence of all his people."† I had not studied the Will to so little purpose, as not to know how, in the first instance, these vows were to be paid; I was familiar with the words of the Testator, "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven;"‡ "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved;" "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." And also with those of Paul; "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."§ "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am chief."‖ I knew myself to be something like Paul; if not the chief of sinners, yet among the chief. I felt therefore as if what Ananias said to the apostle, was said to myself; "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."¶

I was convinced that the ordinance of baptism is indispensable, and that it was established by Christ to the end that every genuine convert should by it manifest his faith in him, and in his inviolable promise.** And I was equally convinced, that while I disregarded it, I had nothing to hope for, seeing I could not appropriate to myself the blessings promised by "the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him."†† I felt that, according to the Testator's commission, the observance of this ordinance is obligatory on every believer; that it is the only appointed way into his church,—that church, through which only lies the way to eternal glory,‡‡—and that it was therefore essential to my salvation; otherwise I should for ever be ashamed, not having respect unto all his commandments.§§ I was also convinced that no man can be a disciple of his, who lives in the habitual neglect of any of them; for he says, "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my

* James ii. 5.
† Psalm cxvi. 12—14.
‡ Matt. x. 32.
§ Rom. x 9, 10.
‖ 1 Tim. i. 15.
¶ Acts xxii. 16.
** Mark xvi. 16.
†† Heb. v. 9.
‡‡ Acts ii. 47.
§§ Psalm cxix. 6.

Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him."* And again, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have *right* to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."†

The scales were now so far removed from my eyes as to enable me to see that I could not expect to be further enlightened while I remained an alien "from the commonwealth of Israel;" and therefore, whenever I prayed to be further led into "the mystery of the gospel," my conscience smote me; for I was convinced that while I forbore to make an open and public profession, I could not justify God,‡ nor glorify the Father,§ nor "bring forth fruit unto God."‖ I saw that, as I had not been born in Zion, I could not be privileged to call him Father, nor be reckoned among his children,¶ nor in any way whatever stand as a member of the body of Christ.** I knew that, with two exceptions, previous to baptism in water, none had been baptized with the Holy Ghost, by which latter baptism only the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts,†† and all the comforting influences of that love imparted.

Then came the struggle; how was I to summon courage to confess my sins, and profess my faith before the church, and afterward before the congregation? A false shame, combined with a deep sense of the momentous solemnity of the ordinance, caused me for a short time to hesitate: I was confident that, according to the declaration Mark xvi. 16, there was salvation for me, and that my heart was right "in the sight of God." Still I was diffident; and not being gifted with a ready utterance, I feared I should not be able to express my faith so as to give satisfaction. I felt that to go before the church, though it was composed of a few plain individuals only, was a most overpowering thing; and that it was going more immediately into the presence of God. It appeared a fiery trial, which I dreaded, yet desired; for this text of scripture was ever before me, "Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed, when he shall come in his own glory, and in his Father's, and of the holy angels."‡‡

I was instructed that, although I had no strength in myself, there was strength promised to me; "Fear thou not, for I am with thee: be not dismayed, for I am thy God: I will strengthen thee,

* John xiv. 21. † Rev. xxii. 14. ‡ Luke vii. 29.
§ Matt. v. 16. ‖ Rom. vii. 4. ¶ 2 Cor. vi. 18.
** 1 Cor. xii. 27. †† Rom. v. 5. ‡‡ Luke ix. 26.

yea, I will help thee; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness."* I was taught, also, that to be sensible of my own weakness was the sure way to lead me to look to God for his promised support; as it is stated by the apostle, "My grace is sufficient for thee, for my strength is made perfect in weakness."† I felt no dread of making shipwreck of faith and of a good conscience,‡ being assured, by the Great Shepherd, that in following him I should be safe. "My sheep," says he, "hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hand."§ I was further convinced that I had nothing to fear, if I gave myself up entirely to his keeping; and an inward impulse, which I could not withstand, urged me forward, and determined me with humble boldness to confess my Lord in his ordinance of baptism, after the example of those who had previously received his testimony.

Up to this period I had concealed from others the painful workings of my mind, and my internal struggles. I had never communicated the troubles of my soul to, or consulted with, any individual. But being drawn "with cords of a man, with bands of love,"‖ my rebellious heart was subdued, and made "willing in the day of his power."¶ I communicated my desire to go before the church, and in so doing felt a satisfaction, and an ease of mind, that I have not words to describe. It was then that what I would previously have "put far away from me" became the desire of my heart. To be permitted to confess my Redeemer, and declare what he had done for my soul,** I esteemed my highest honour, my most exalted privilege, my ineffable joy.

After mature deliberation, the members of the church, most of whom had been acquainted with my former manner of life, consented to hear me. They were satisfied with my testimony; and on the Lord's day, the 7th of October, 1827, I made, at the water's side, and before the whole congregation, a confession of my sins, and a profession of my faith; after which, I was baptized in due form and order. In the afternoon, the minister laid his hands upon me, in faith of the illumination of the Holy Spirit. Thus was I inducted into the church, received into fellowship, and joined with

* Isa. xli. 10. † 2 Cor. xii. 9. ‡ 1 Tim. i. 19. § John x. 27, 28.
‖ Hos. xi. 4. ¶ Psalm cx. 3. ** Psalm lxvi. 16.

my fellow-believers in a further confession of the Lord, by partaking of his supper, the observance of which he has appointed, until "he shall appear the second time." By symbolically eating his flesh and drinking his blood in this institution, we manifest, as by a lively figure, that it is through and upon him we live; for "the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me."*

Ever since that period I have enjoyed uninterrupted tranquillity, and "perfect peace;" seeking to "be filled with the knowledge of his will, in all wisdom and spiritual understanding,"† and to be made more conformable to his image. I am far from asserting that my mind has never been disturbed or cast down with earthly disappointments, or perplexed with the anticipation of evil; I am, as I have all my life been, occasionally subject to a constitutional depression of spirits; I therefore know, by experience, that "the grace of God corrects, but does not eradicate the passions: it forms us christians, but it leaves us men."‡ Still, I can truly affirm, that, from the time I made a profession to the present day, I have never felt a shadow of misgiving respecting my eternal welfare. Notwithstanding, I know, and confess with sorrow, that in many things I offend; that I come exceedingly short in all; and that I bring very little glory to his name. Yet, as we find in the Will that similar declarations to these have been made in all ages, by the greatest characters among the people of God, my confidence in him is not disturbed. All may well say with the psalmist, "If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand?"§ I do not question my salvation, and therefore have neither doubts nor fears. I know that I love his name; that I desire to live to his glory; the Spirit itself bearing witness with my spirit that I am a child of God.‖ And although my footsteps may slip, I have the comforting assurance of his word, that "he that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit;"¶ that "the steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord, and he delighteth in his way. Though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down; for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand."** Having no confidence in the flesh, I am convinced that I cannot be "preserved in Jesus Christ,"†† without being aided by him

* Gal. ii. 20. † Col. i. 9. ‡ See Acts xiv. 15; James v. 17.
§ Psalm cxxx. 3. ‖ Rom. viii. 16.
¶ John xiii. 10. ** Psalm xxxvii. 23, 24. †† Jude i.

to watch over myself with a godly jealousy, to observe whatsoever he has commanded, "and to walk humbly with my God," in full reliance on his faithful promises, being free from presumption and false confidence on the one hand, and from *distrust*, under the semblance of humility, on the other. "He abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself."* Here, then, I rest secure, believing on his word to "the saving of the soul."

Having, gentlemen, thus entered into the sheepfold by the way appointed by the Great Shepherd,—and not, as a thief or a robber, climbed up some other way,—I feel myself under his protection, and enjoy "the earnest of" my "inheritance, until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory."†

* 2 Tim. ii. 13. † Eph. i. 14.

ADDRESS OF THE JUDGE.

The Judge then addressed the Jury as follows:—

Gentlemen,

As one of the Judges of this realm, it has fallen to my lot to sit here during the pleadings of this great cause; a cause involving, not a subject of a temporal nature, but one of infinite moment—the eternal state of every man to whom the Testator has, in his great goodness, sent his Will: for, according as we hear his sayings and do them, or do them not, so shall we be rendered for ever happy, or for ever miserable.* This consideration should solemnise our minds, and operate as a check upon everything bordering on levity and impiety,—a consideration which, I am constrained to say, has, during this trial, been in many instances disregarded.

Gentlemen, as becomes my high and responsible station, while sitting upon this bench, I have attended to all that has been advanced on either side, so far as I know my own mind, without partiality or prejudice; and I am persuaded that you also have attended to the points which have been successively brought before you in the same manner, and with a mind as free from bias as my own.

On the one side, gentlemen, you have heard the subject argued by many of the most distinguished men of this country, aided by a foreigner of great attainments; all of them men celebrated for great learning, profound judgment, acuteness, and deep research; who have left no subject unexplored, that promised to throw light upon their cause; and who, whenever a difficulty has arisen respecting any passage of the Will, have endeavoured to remove it by appealing to ancient writers and ancient customs. They contend that, as respects the cause before us, this is the only way by which we can arrive at a satisfactory conclusion; and that the precedent of former ages is sufficient to establish their practice. To you, gentlemen,

* Matt. vii. 24—27.

and to every one in this court, it must be evident, that the Plaintiffs' Counsel and Witnesses have manifested the greatest ingenuity and acumen, laying hold of every circumstance that appeared in their favour. And I think you will conclude with me, that on their side of the question nothing new, more convincing, or more conclusive, could have been elicited.

On the other side, the Defendants acknowledge that they are unlettered men; and they have shown us, that whatever they may know of the writings and practices of the ancients, they have thought that a reference to them would neither add to, nor detract from, the merits of their case. They have therefore appealed exclusively to the Will, contending that it ought to be studied at the present time as if it had been the production of yesterday; that it is as easy to be understood now, as it was at the time of its first publication; that "the way of salvation" is so clearly revealed in it, that "he may run that readeth it;"* and that it is so definite in its statements, as of itself, when accompanied with "earnest desire," and the teaching of the Holy Spirit, to be sufficient to show to man "the path of life," and to furnish him with all needful "wisdom and knowledge;" which wisdom and knowledge, say they, will, if sought for with fervent prayer, and a reliance upon the promises, assuredly lead him to mansions of eternal glory.

Gentlemen, I now leave you to pronounce, from the evidence you have heard, whether it be more in accordance with the tenor of the gospel to sprinkle an infant, or to baptize a believer; or, in other words, whether of the two, the Plaintiffs or Defendants have in the clearest manner shown before this court which is the true scriptural "way of salvation."†

But it is my duty to acquaint you, that, according to the law of the land as it now stands, and which I sit here to expound, the evidence respecting the word baptize is fatal to the Plaintiffs; and must be so, while the act of parliament, which establishes the meaning of the word to be TO DIP, remains unrepealed. To this meaning, the Counsel for the Plaintiffs, and three of their Witnesses, have not only subscribed, but have sworn to act in conformity with it; while the seven remaining Witnesses have, either directly or indirectly, admitted that *baptize* and *dip* are synonymous terms.

* Hab. ii. 2. † Acts xvi. 17.

THE VERDICT.

The Jury, without leaving the box, gave a verdict for the Defendants; when,

The Judge, addressing them, said,

Gentlemen,

The verdict you have given must be considered, by every unprejudiced person, to be in accordance with the evidence you have heard; more especially, as the Plaintiffs have not produced ONE positive proof, by which to establish their claim. Nevertheless, no one must build his salvation on your decision, because salvation is a personal thing, and can only be obtained by searching the divine testimony, diligently and with earnest prayer, each one for himself; supplicating the illumination of the Holy Spirit, and making all the knowledge that testimony contains his own; receiving nothing on the mere authority of man. I would, in christian love, inform the Plaintiffs, that, whether they move for a new trial or not, the cause must again be heard, before a superior court, where no appeal, either to the ancients or to the moderns, will be received. In that court, all will be summoned to attend; and, as far as each individual is concerned, whether the summons be received in a day, a month, or a year, none can tell. I would, therefore, as a friend, advise them to lose no time in seeking the means by which they may be enabled to comply with the requirements of the Will; so that, when the final summons shall come, they may be enabled to establish their claim, and be greeted with the joyful welcome, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."*

* Matthew xxv. 34.

INDEX

OF PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS IN THE TRIAL.

Page

Adult immersion, at Christ Church, extracted from the "Liverpool Mail" 347—349

Anabaptists, commencement of the German 27

Animadversions of the Counsel for the Defendants, on the testimony of the different Witnesses, 61—93, 120—154, 159—163, 174—195, 202—211, 216—226, 228—232, 236—247, 249, 252—254, 258—271, 284—313, 318—330, 335—339, 344—353, 370—385, ... 386—431

Archbishop of Canterbury's remark on "contaminated religion," 449; his recommendation to his clergy 501

Arnold, Dr., his opinion upon the power of bishops, quoted, 500; upon the education of children 514

Augustine on infant baptism, quoted 13

Author's denomination, The, consist in churches few in number, and little known, 538; their belief . . . . . 538—540

Baptism, its proper object, a cause of agitation for nearly 1800 years, 1; infant advocated, 9—28; first scriptural account of its institution, 78; its design, 550—552; its importance proved on scripture grounds, 560—563; ministration of public, in the Church of England, according to the "Book of Common Prayer," 79, 208; remarks of clergymen thereupon, 289, 476, 530; "ministration of private," according to the Church of England 449

Basil's remarks on faith and baptism 13, 480

Berington's popish opinions quoted 442, 474, 495

Berridge, Rev. John, remark on the Church Catechism 471, 181

Beveridge, Bishop, remark on Acts x. 47, 48 227

Bickersteth, Rev. E., extracts from his "Treatise on Baptism," 7—13; extracts from his "Promised Glory of the Church of Christ," 395, 438, 448, 456—461; extracts from his "Signs of the Times in the East" . 526

Bradford's opinion of the succession of bishops 502

British Critic, referred to 428

Bugg, Rev. G., "Key to Modern Controversy," quoted . . . 299, 480

Burial of the dead, the order for the, according to the Church of England, referred to 468

Burkitt, Rev. Wm., remarks on baptism, 36; on the christening of infants, 95; remarks on John iii. 5, 164; Mark xvi. 16; Acts ii. 41, 196; viii. 36—39, 212; x. 47, 48, 227; xvi. 30—34, 233; xviii. 8, 248; 1 Cor. i. 16, 249; Acts xvi. 14, 15, 254; Matt. xviii. 2—6, 272; 1 Cor. vii. 14, 314; x. 1, 2, 331; 1 Peter iii. 21, 340; Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12, 13 . . . 355

Page
Calvin's remarks on Acts ii. 38, 39 14
Campbell, Rev. Aug., "Law of the Rubric," quoted, 297; Sermon preached at the "Archidiaconal Visitation," quoted, as it regards the "state" payments to support divers religions in the world . . . . 439—441
Chalmers, Dr., Lectures on the Romans, quoted 304
Cheyne, Dr., "on Derangement of the Mind," quoted 402
Christening of the Wife of the Michigan Chief, with the "Record" Newspaper's remarks thereupon 84, 85
Christening infants, the mode of, as adopted by the Church of England 3
Church of England "Prayer-book" referred to . . 180, 396, 494, 498
Churchman's Monthly Review, quoted, . . . 437, 472, 497, 500
Clarke, Dr. Adam, on the institution of baptism, the mode of its administration, &c., 33—36; on the christening of infants, 93—95; his remarks on John iii. 23, 154; iii. 5, 163, Matt. xxviii. 19, Mark xvi. 16, Acts ii. 41, 195; viii. 39, 211; x. 47, 48, 226; xvi. 30—34, 232; xviii. 8. 248; 1 Cor. i. 16, 250; Acts xvi. 14, 15, 254; Matt. xviii. 2—6, 271; 1 Cor. vii. 14, 314; x. 1, 2, 330; 1 Peter iii. 21, 339; Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12, 13 . 354
Coleman's "Church without a Prelate," quoted 183, 490
Communion, Christian, examined 386, 431
Counsel for the Plaintiff's speech at the commencement of the Trial . 1—32
Counsel for the Defendants' reply to the Plaintiffs' Counsel, 432—532; his defence . . . . . 533—564
Cross-examination of the Witnesses on the christening of infants 94, 96, 100, 108, 113, 277, 299; further cross-examination of . . . 393—421

Death-bed professions 554
Dublin, Archbishop of, petition presented to the House of Peers on the behalf of an "United Church of England and Ireland," 497; Bishop of Ripon's remarks thereupon 498
Dwight, Dr., remarks upon baptism by sprinkling and immersion, 41, 42; on the christening of infants, 98—100; his remarks on John iii. 23, 154; iii. 5, 170—172: Matt. xxviii. 19, Mark xvi. 16, Acts ii. 41, 197; viii. 36—39, 212; xvi. 30—34, 234; Matt. xviii. 2—6, 276—278; 1 Cor. vii. 14, 316; x. 1, 2, 332; 1 Peter iii. 21, 342; Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12, 13, 358; extracts from his writings 405. 406

Establishment, remarks quoted from the "British Critic," upon our Ecclesiastical, 25; why many cling thereto, ... 466
"Evangelical Alliance, The," referred to 414, 506
Evangelical Magazine, an extract therefrom, shewing what ought "to be regarded as a sacrament of Christ" 383
Ewing, Rev. Greville, his remarks on Baptism, 44—48; on the christening of infants, 107; his remarks on John iii. 23, 155; iii. 5, 172; Acts ii. 41; Mark xvi. 16, 199; Acts viii. 36—39, 213; x. 47, 48, 228; xvi. 30—34, 235; 1 Cor. x. 1, 2, 333; 1 Peter iii. 21, 342; Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12, 13, 361—364; extracts from his writings, 411.
Example, value of good, of parents to their children . . . 513

Fathers, Primitive, their testimony respecting infant baptism . . 523

Gibbons, Dr. on Dr. Watts' suggestion respecting a compromise with his Baptist brethren 381

Page

Godley's "Letters from America," extracts therefrom, on the state of religion in that country . . . . . 71—73

Hall, Rev. Francis Russel, on infant baptism 13
Hall, Rev. Robert, on open communion, 386—388; his works quoted, 392, 426; on strict communion 535
Henry, Rev. Matthew, observations on Matthew iii. 16, 17; Acts viii. 38. 218
Hooker, his remarks on baptism, 14, 541; his creed referred to . . 488
Hull, Rev. Edward, his petition to the House of Lords in favour "of some alteration in the Prayer-book" . . . . . 502—504

"Infant Baptism scriptural and reasonable," extract from, 217; referred to by the Rev. Capel Molyneux 476
James, Rev. D., "Sermon on the Conduct of the Romish Church with regard to the Bible," quoted 443
Jay, Rev. William, his works quoted 426
Jewel, Bishop, his Apology quoted 502
Jordan, waters of the River, desirable for christening infants, according to the opinion of some Bishops of the Church of England . . 467
Judge, the, Address of 577, 578
Judgments of God on his people, for intermarrying with the world . 318—320

Kingdon, Rev. T. H., extracts from his "Baptism Considered" . . 81—84

Langley, Rev. Mr., public christening *free of fees*, Jan. 25, 1842 . 469
Latimer quoted, 168; referred to 467
Lightfoot, Dr., on Baptism, quoted, 35, 36, 96; on Jewish parents, quoted 151
London, Bishop of, communication with his clergy, respecting the Prayer Book and the Rubric 500

M'Neile, Rev. Hugh, extracts from his Letters to a Friend, 4—7; extracts from his Lectures on the Church of England, 140, 437, 490—496, 501; his Sermons on the Second Advent quoted, 305, 436, 461—463; his Lectures on the Jews quoted 433
Maut, Dr., his Remarks on Baptism, 37; on John iii. 5, 164—169; Matt. xviii. 2—6, 273—275; Col. ii. 12, 13; Rom. vi. 3—5. . . . 356
Manufacturer, a retired, his own account of being plunged in a cold bath 77
Mather, Dr., accusation of the Baptists referred to . . . 524
Millennial state, Author's remarks on 463, 464
Miller, Dr., "Infant Baptism Scriptural and Reasonable," extract therefrom 126
Milner quoted 471
"Modern Immersion not Scripture Baptism" quoted . . . 534
Morrison's Report of the Chinese Education Society quoted . . 311
Moses a peculiar type of Christ 335, 336

Newton, Sir Isaac, his remark respecting the Baptists . . . 477
Newton, Rev. John, quoted 472
Nowell's catechism quoted 441

Ordinary disciples, in the days of the apostles, were the persons that administered the ordinances 445, 446

Page
Osgood, Dr., his statement on infant baptism 25, 522
Oxford, miserable theology of, extract from the "Churchman's Monthly Review and Chronicle" 437
Ould, Rev. F., his opinion of the law of England . . . 467
Parents, their reprehensible conduct towards their children . . 514
Perseverance of the saints 487
Plain man's opinion of a "highly talented preacher" . . . 377
Pope, the, his last Encyclical Letter quoted 498
Popery, temporary triumph of 526
Population, Alison's Principles of, quoted 511

Quarterly Review, its testimony of "Carey, Ward, and Marshman" . 217

Reformation, divines of the, referred to, 488; their gradual departure from popery 489

Registration, general, of Births, commented upon . . . 469
Ridley, Bishop, on Popery, quoted 425
Roman Catholic Church, and the Church of England, much resembling each other, according to the opinion of some Bishops of the latter Church, 183; other resemblances referred to . . . 473
Rubric, The, referred to 289

Salvation, Basis of 555
Secker, on immersion, quoted 13
Scott, Rev. Thomas, extracts from his "Life" and "Force of Truth," 38, 39, 399, 404; remarks on the institution of baptism, &c., 38, 40; on the christening of infants, 97; remarks on John iii. 23, 154; iii. 5, 170; Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts ii. 41; 196; viii. 36—39, 212; x. 47, 48, 227; xvi. 30—34, 233; xviii. 8, 248; 1 Cor. i. 16, 250; Acts xvi. 14, 15; 254; Matt. xviii. 2—6, 275; 1 Cor. vii. 14, 315; x. 1, 2; 332; 1 Peter iii. 21, 341; Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12, 13; 357; 1 Tim. v. 21, 438; on christian communion, 390; on the Lord's supper 454
Shiel, Mr., M. P., his opinion of the Church of England . . 183
Stewart, Dr., his remarks on baptism by sprinkling and immersion, 55—60; on John iii. 23, 158; Matt. xxviii. 19, 201; Acts viii. 36—39, 214; 1 Cor. x. 1, 2; 333; Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12, 13; 367—369; on baptismal controversy 418, 419
Sin, original, remarks on . . . . . 278, 290, 304, 509—511
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, its Tract 191 quoted, 468; referred to by the "Liverpool Albion" 469
Superstitions of the Church of England 395
Supper, the Lord's, persons differing in the mode and period of its administration . . . . . 451—453

Terms of *Christening* and *Baptism*, how to be used . . . 62
Testator, his Will, 2, 545; his commission . . . . 546—548
Towgood, Rev. Micaiah, his testimony on Baptism, as the representative of eleven other ministers, 48—52; 412; on the christening of infants, 108—116; remarks on John iii. 23, 155—157; iii. 5, 172—174; Matt. xxviii. 19, 200; Acts viii. 36—39, 214; xvi. 30—34, 235; xvi. 14, 15, 256; Matt. xviii. 2—6,

Page

279—281; 1 Cor. vii. 14, 317; x. 1, 2; 333; 1 Pet. iii. 21, 343; Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12, 13 364
"Tracts for the Last Days," extract therefrom 180
Truth and error contrasted 549

Verdict, the 579
Vicar of Leeds, his remark on the wine in the sacrament, 182; opinion of the Prayer Book 297
Voluntary Churchman's testimony of the corrupt conduct of the Oxford students 515

Wales, The young Prince of, referred to 468
Wall, Dr., his remarks on infant baptism 26, 27
Will of the Testator, and its two clauses, stated by the Counsel for the Plaintiffs, 2; his further remarks on the Will, 29—31; examples therefrom, shewing the "tremendous consequences of departing from the commands and institutions of God," 86—92; appointments in the Church of England not found there 442
Wardlaw, Dr., remarks on baptism by sprinkling and immersion, 42, 43; on the christening of infants, 100, 107; extracts from his writings, 131—136, 204—206, 259—261, 299, 308, 378, 408—410; his remarks on John iii. 23, 155; iii. 5, 172; Matt. xxviii. 19, 198; Acts viii. 36—39, 213; x. 47, 48, 228; xvi. 14, 15, 255; Matt. xviii. 2—6, 278; Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12, 13, 359—361; extracts from his Letters to the Rev. Hugh M'Neile . 492
Watson, Rev. Richard, observations on the Will of God, and the sacraments, 52; his remarks on baptism, 53—55; 415—417; on the christening of infants, 116—120; his remarks on John iii. 23, 157; iii. 5, 174; Acts viii. 36—39, 214; xvi. 30—34, 235; 1 Cor. i. 16, 250—252; Acts xvi. 14, 15, 256—258; Matt. xviii. 2—6, 281—284; 1 Peter iii. 21, 343; Rom. vi. 3—5; Col. ii. 12, 13 . . . . . 365—367
Water in Jerusalem, sufficient to baptize the whole of its inhabitants . 210
Watts, Dr., quoted 76, 147, 150, 381, 530
Webb, Bishop, singular wish and prayer of 217
Wesley, Rev. John, referred to 296
Whateley's Errors of Romanism, quoted 490
Whitfield, Rev. George, quoted, 169; referred to 296
Witnesses, characteristics of the ten, 85, 86, 407; their admission that "baptism and immersion are synonymous terms," and that the defendants have been baptized according to the commission, 428—431; their testimony of unbaptized children, 530—532; their divers statements referred to, 541—543
Witness for the Defendants, 565; his account of himself . . 565—576
Worship, "times and places" of, according to the scriptures . . 464

INDEX

OF SCRIPTURE PASSAGES MORE OR LESS TREATED UPON.

		Page
Gen.	iv. 7.	87.
	vi. 2, 3.	319.
	vii. 1.	345.
	xvii. 7–14.	107. 110.
Exod.	xii. 43–49.	161.
	xiii. 21.	331.
	xiv. 22. 29.	333.
	xx. 25.	88.
	xxv. 40.	225.
Lev.	xiv. 26, 27.	64.
	xvi. 23. 25.	68.
Num.	xix. 18, 19.	160.
	xx. 12.	87.
Deut.	xviii. 15.	335.
	xxix. 10–12.	110.
1 Sam.	vi. 19.	89.
1 Kings	xiii.	88.
2 Kings	v. 14.	160.
1 Chron.	xv. 13.	89.
Psalm	xxii. 30.	447.
	xlix. 7.	287.
	lxvi. 16.	238.
Isa.	ii. 8.	449.
	xi. 15.	506.
	xxiv. 5.	74.
	xxx. 10.	ix.
	xlv. 22.	292.
	liv. 13.	513.
	lv. 4.	335.
Jer.	xxxi. 15. 17.	176.
	33, 34.	445.
Zeph.	iii. 9.	92.
Matt.	iii. 1. 5, 6.	154.
	11.	163.
	15.	69.
	16.	213.
	x. 34.	ix.
	xii. 30.	389.
	50.	v 312.
	xviii. 2–6.	271.
	6.	285.
	xix. 6.	241.
	13, 14.	272.
	xxiv. 9.	77.
	xxviii. 19.	195.
Mark	i. 1.	161.
	ix. 38–40.	389.
	43.	78.
	x. 13.	309.
	15.	272.
	xvi. 16.	64. 171. 195. 203. 323.
Luke	ii. 22, 23.	317.
	iii. 3.	543.
	vi. 17.	309.
	xii. 8.	64.
	xiv. 26.	77.
	29.	295.
	xviii. 15–17.	272.
John	i. 13.	192.
	33.	163.
	iii. 5.	163, 164. 170.
	8.	231.
	23.	154.
	vi. 44.	259.
Acts	ii. 38, 39.	277.
	41.	195.
	41, 42.	144.
	iv. 4.	258.
	viii. 12.	299.
	13–23.	142.
	36–39.	211.
	ix. 18, 19.	233.
	x. 35.	291.
	44–48.	227.
	47, 48.	226.
	xvi. 14, 15.	254.
	30–34.	232.

		Page
Acts	xviii. 8.	248.
	xix. 4. 6.	226.
	xx. 7.	452.
	11.	445.
Rom.	ii. 28, 29.....	64.
	iv. 11, 12.....	352.
	vi. 3–5.	354.
	x. 14, 15.....	446.
	15.	439.
1 Cor.	i. 16.	249.
	21.	426.
	iii. 1, 2.	300.
	vii. 14.	314.
	39.	324.
	x. 1, 2.	330.
	xi. 1.	326.
	xv. 29.	393.
	31.	370.
	xvi. 1, 2.	453.
	15–18.....	250.
2 Cor.	vi. 14–18.....	324.
	17.	390.

		Page
2 Cor.	viii. 5.	406.
Gal.	5ii. 13.	85.
	20.	358.
	iii. 26–29.....	142.
	vi. 14.	370.
	15.	95.
Eph.	iv. 5.	241. 256.
	vi. 4.	265.
Col.	ii. 11.	358.
	12.	95.
	12, 13.....	354.
	20–22.....	63.
Heb.	vii. 19–24.....	493.
	viii. 5.	69.
	xi. 7.	345.
1 Pet.	ii. 2.	178.
	28.	76.
	iii. 21.	339.
2 John	4.	269.
Rev.	iii. 17.	230.
	xi. 15.	71.
	xxii. 18, 19.....	473.

LETTER

TO

JOSEPH JOHN GURNEY, ESQ.,

ON

BAPTISM AND THE SUPPER.

LETTER.

SIR,

A short time after you had been lecturing in Liverpool, in the early part of the year 1832, I took the liberty of addressing you by letter, stating that I had been informed that, in one of your lectures, you had asserted that baptism in water was not commanded of God; and that your assertion was grounded solely on the words of the apostle Paul, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." I took occasion to observe that, before you could controvert all that is stated in the gospel touching that ordinance, you must, in order to justify your non-observance of it, have other and more convincing texts than this; and I added, also, that I should feel obliged if you would inform me in what part of the New Testament such texts could be found. To this you courteously replied, "As thou wast not present at the public meeting for worship to which thy letter alludes, thou canst not judge of what was then spoken. In point of fact, thy notion of what *I did* say is quite exaggerated." On the receipt of this communication, I apologized, and expressed my sorrow for having imputed to you sentiments which you disavow.

Soon after our correspondence terminated, your publication, entitled "Observations on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends," (first edition,) was put into my hands. From this publication I shall take permission to make a few extracts, and to point out how much the sentiments you entertain come short of the standard of truth. I shall make the extracts as concise as I can, yet so as not to affect their true bearing; and if I should in any instance take a wrong view of them, it will not be intentional. Your work is before the public, and to enable those who may read the following sheets to refer more readily to it, I shall give the pages from which the extracts are taken.

In the ninth page of the preface, you say, "The views which I have attempted to unfold are of a nature entirely *religious*: it has

of course been necessary for me largely to refer to that sacred book to the test of which all religious opinions are rightly brought, since it was given by the inspiration of God, and contains a divinely authorised record both of the doctrines which we ought to believe, and of the duties which we are required to practise. I wish to take the present opportunity of expressing my conviction, that for *the most important* practical purposes the common English version of the Bible may be understood with sufficient precision, without the aid of the critic or the annotator." Again, at page 351 of the work; "We cannot do better than bring our several peculiarities respectively to the test of that clear revelation of the divine will which is contained in the Holy Scriptures, and which more particularly distinguishes the New Testament."

Here, sir, we are of one mind, and concur that our separate views of the truth shall be tested by the authorised translation of the Divine Standard. But then, we must take the book as a whole, and compare one part with another; we must not attempt to render void its meaning, by quoting particular texts, independent of their connexion with other texts, or of their general bearing; nor suffer our judgment to be determined by isolated passages. As you say, and as I believe, the book contains a divinely authorised record, both of the doctrines which we ought to believe, and of the duties we are required to practise. It must therefore be our pole-star, our only guide, our standard, our "fire" to try each other's work, of what sort it is.* Critics and annotators, generally speaking, only bewilder their readers. It would have been well for the world had the greater portion of them left the book to be its own interpreter. Upon your admission, then, that it is sufficiently clear for the most important purposes, I shall discuss the different points on which we so essentially differ.

"Nor ought we," you say, "in tracing the causes of these differences (opposite views and practices, in connexion with several particulars in religion of a less essential character,) by any means to forget that on many points of a merely secondary nature, those particularly which relate to *modes* of worship and of church government, there is to be found in the divinely authorised records of the christian revelation very little of precise direction; and thus is there obviously left, in reference to such points, a considerable scope for the formation of different views."†

* 1 Cor. iii. 13. † Page 29.

Why, sir, this last paragraph appears to be, not only the very antipodes to the preceding one, but a reflection on the wisdom of the Most High, whose important precepts you thus do not scruple to declare are of "a mere secondary nature." The "mode of worship," sir, may be gathered from the example which the Lord set of the administration of baptism, and also from the baptism of the Spirit, which followed in consequence of it;* from his sermon on the mount;† from his example of celebrating the Supper;‡ from Peter's manner of preaching, and of inducting individuals into the church;§ from Paul's manner of teaching and worshipping;‖ from his instruction how the supper ought to be celebrated;¶ from his further directions, 1 Tim. ii. 1—8, and Heb. x. 25; and also from the doctrine which we are exhorted to believe, which doctrine, sir, is Christ's, and inculcates repentance from dead works, faith towards God, baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection from the dead, and eternal judgment.** Whilst it is said, "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds."†† And again; "But though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."‡‡ We see therefore that it is only by worshipping according to the revealed will of God that we can possibly glorify his name. And as there is only "one body, and one Spirit,...one hope,...one Lord, one faith, one baptism,"§§ any departure from, or any omission of, his doctrine, is a thing of all others that his "soul hateth."‖‖ See, sir, with what severity the rebellious Jews were reproved; "Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar, and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say the table of the Lord is contemptible. And if ye offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if ye offer the lame and sick, is it not evil? Offer it now unto thy governor; will he be pleased with thee, or accept thy person? saith the Lord of hosts."¶¶ The doctrine of the New Testament is as binding to us

* Matt. iii. 15—17. † Matt. v.—vii. ‡ Matt. xxvi. 26—30.
§ Acts ii. 14—47. ‖ Acts xx. 17—36. ¶ 1 Cor. xi. 20—34.
** Heb. vi. 1, 2. †† 2 John 9—11. ‡‡ Gal. i. 8. §§ Eph. iv. 4, 5.
‖‖ See Deut. viii. 19, 20; xiii. 5—10; xviii. 19, 20; Amos v. 21; Matt. xv. 8, 9; Rev. xiv. 9, 10.
¶¶ Mal. i. 7, 8.

as the doctrine of the Old Testament was to the Jews; and it was their schoolmaster to bring them to Christ.* And it is from the Old Testament that we derive the most appalling examples of the dreadful punishments which await all who disregard the commandments of God; and therefore any deviation from the rule laid down in the gospel is neither more nor less than offering polluted bread upon the altar of God.

"The mode of church government" may be gathered also from Paul's directions to the members of the Roman church, in which he requires that each individual shall take that part in the worship for which he has the best gift;† from his direction how each one was to exercise his peculiar gift;‡ from his instruction respecting offenders;§ from his directions respecting marriage;‖ and also from the sentence of James.¶

David says, "The words of the Lord are pure words;"** and, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple."†† Zephaniah, personating the Lord, says, "Then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent."‡‡ This prophecy, it is true, has reference to the day when "all shall know the" Lord, "from the least unto the greatest."§§ But then that glorious day will not be brought about by any other means than those which we already have. It is by the neglect of this "pure language," that the world is divided "into a variety of particular societies;" yet you advocate these societies, these diversities among men, as in "various respects *overruled* for their good."‖‖ And you say, "they are in a pre-eminent manner baptized by one Spirit, into one body. How delightful," you go on to remark, "is the union which subsists among the numerous members of this holy family!" But where is the proof of this union. "Can two walk together except they be agreed?"¶¶ No; nor do I see how it is possible, sir, that the union of such parties can be delightful, when you acknowledge "that their views in some respects are far from being perfectly coincident, that they are ranged under various banners, and are designated by a considerable diversity of denomination."***

* Gal. iii. 24. † Rom. xii. 1—10. ‡ 1 Cor. xiv. 1—33.
§ 1 Cor. v. & vi. See also Rev. ii. 14—16. 20; iii. 15, 16.
‖ 1 Cor. vii. ¶ Acts xv. 19, 20. ** Psalm xii. 6.
†† Psalm xix. 7. ‡‡ Zeph. iii. 9. §§ Heb. viii. 11.
‖‖ Page 29. ¶¶ Amos iii. 3. *** Page 26.

Now, sir, allow me to turn your attention to the apostle Paul, whom you acknowledge to have enjoyed as clear a view of the operations of divine grace as any of the inspired writers,* in order to show how you are at variance with him. It is "unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints,"—those who had been baptized in water, previous to their being baptized with the Holy Spirit,—that Paul says, "by one Spirit *we* are all baptized into one body." This one body, doubtless, consisted of one denomination only, and that one, in the legitimate sense of the word, *the Christian* denomination. "I beseech you, brethren, (said he to these Corinthians,) by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment. For it hath been declared unto me of you, my brethren,...that there are contentions among you;...that every one of you saith, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ." And he reproves them, by saying, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, *lest* any should say, that I baptized in my own name."† If, as you say, the scriptures give little precise direction how we are to worship, they cannot be a perfect law; and if they cannot be clearly understood, no condemnation can ensue from mistaking them; neither can the Lord be just,—I speak it with reverence,—when he declares, "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and that men loved darkness rather than light;"‡ nor be justified when he speaketh, nor clear when he judgeth.§ Surely, in this case, his creatures might reproach him for judging them by a law which he has not fully and clearly made known to them. "For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"‖ I leave it to you, sir, to reconcile your two conflicting paragraphs.

Again; you say that believers "have found in that holy religion, as it is recorded in the Holy Scriptures, a plain statement of all those truths which appertain to men's salvation;"¶ that you "consider that it is only under the new and more spiritual dispensation, that the divine law is revealed to us in all its purity, and in all its completeness;"** "that there is no use or security in the superstructure, except it be erected upon a sure foundation; and that, in

* Page 39. † 1 Cor. i. ‡ John iii. 19. § Psalm li. 4.
‖ 1 Cor. xiv. 8. ¶ Page 23. ** Page 59.

religious matters, 'other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus.'"*

Now, sir, the utmost ingenuity of man can neither make the foregoing statements correspond with the assertion that "diversities in religion are in various respects overruled for good;" nor discover in the scriptures any foundation save one, nor any solid superstructure resting upon that one, but that which has been erected according to the *one* plan of the Divine Architect. Except the pastors abide by the word, how can the people be saved?

"It is our belief," you say,† "that we have been led out of the practice of these rites (baptism and the supper,) by the Spirit of truth; that we could not recur to them without grieving our heavenly Monitor; and that, in fact, they are not in accordance with the entire spirituality of the gospel dispensation."

The commission of our Lord, according to the Evangelist Matthew, runs as follows; "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world. Amen."‡ And according to the Evangelist Mark, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature: he that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.... And they went forth, and preached every where, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word with signs following."§ On the day of Pentecost, the first day on which the disciples, after being baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire, acted on their commission, Peter said to the Jews, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.... Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls."‖ In these texts, the literal baptism in water, and the metaphorical baptism of the Spirit, are so distinguished, that they can never be confounded; nor, according to them, can the comforting influence of the latter be enjoyed, until the former, on which it is consequent, has had place; while they furnish sufficient

* Page 367. † Page 61. ‡ Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.
§ Mark xvi. 15—20. ‖ Acts ii. 38—41.

proof that the baptism of the Spirit succeeds to genuine baptism in water, as surely and as regularly as day succeeds to night.

Ananias was sent, by the express command of God, to teach and baptize Saul.* Paul and Silas were sent, in like manner, to preach the gospel in Macedonia, where they taught and baptized Lydia and the jailer, and their families.† Philip was sent expressly by the angel of the Lord to teach and baptize the eunuch;‡ and Peter to teach Cornelius and his friends, whom he commanded to be baptized.§ When the Samaritans believed "Philip's preaching,... they were baptized, both men and women."‖ And Paul, writing to the Galatians, says, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."¶ Now, sir, if it be true, as you say, that you have been led out of the practice of baptism by the Spirit of truth, is it not natural thence to infer, that Ananias, Paul, Silas, Peter, and Philip, were led into it at first by the spirit of error? They had the gift of tongues, which "are for a sign not to them that believe, but to them that believe not."**

In respect of the supper, the Evangelist Luke asserts, that the Saviour of the world gave his disciples a command to eat it in remembrance of him;†† and Paul, who tells the Corinthians that he had received of the Lord the direction he delivered to them, repeats the same command, and adds, "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."‡‡ If, then, the ordinances of baptism and the supper be "not in accordance with the entire spirituality of the gospel dispensation," the whole of it is a dead letter, and we are left "without Christ, having no hope, and without God in the world."§§

Paul, writing to the Corinthians concerning spiritual gifts, says, "Wherefore, I give you to understand that no man, speaking by the Spirit of God, calleth Jesus accursed: and that no man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost."‖‖ Now, sir, allow me to ask, where is the difference in the sin, between calling Jesus accursed, and openly rejecting, and teaching others to reject, his commandments?¶¶ This is what the Jews, who hated him, did, and for which they were reproved in the following terms: "Full well ye reject (or frustrate) the commandment of God, that ye may keep

* See Acts ix.
† Acts xvi.
‡ Acts viii. 26—39.
§ Acts x.
‖ Acts viii. 12—17.
¶ Gal. iii. 26—27.
** 1 Cor. xiv. 22.
†† Luke xxii. 19.
‡‡ 1 Cor. xi. 23.
§§ Ephes. ii. 12.
‖‖ 1 Cor. xii. 3.
¶¶ See Gal. i. 8, 9.

your own tradition; ... making the word of God of none effect, through your tradition."* Our Lord says, "He that hateth me, hateth my Father also;"† and, by the same rule, he that hateth the ordinances of Christ, hateth Christ also. While this present world shall remain, the New Testament ordinances must be observed; they are adapted to the weakness of our nature, and constitute a prominent part of the worship of God. Independent of them, he cannot be worshipped in "spirit and in truth;" nor can they be abolished, until "the resurrection of the just," when the saints shall be as their Master.‡

In pages 67 — 73 of your work, you quote the opinions of a number of Jewish and other learned writers respecting baptism, and then say, "These points of resemblance, between the proselyte baptism of the Jews and the baptism of the Christians, are so important and so striking, as to render it nearly indisputable that the one baptism was borrowed from the other." From which you argue, as in page 65, that, "the system of types and sacrificial ordinances, therefore, being 'taken away,' and the system of spiritualities being by the coming of Christ established, we are no longer to worship the Father through the intervention of a human priesthood, of formal ceremonies, or of typical institutions, but *solely* through the mediation of the High Priest of our profession, and under the immediate and all-sufficient influences of the Holy Ghost."

Now, sir, even if the ordinance of baptism had been practised among the Jews, (which I deny, and which, from your manner of expression, you indicate—nay, which you admit, may be disputed, by saying, "The baptism of proselytes is no where mentioned in the Old Testament,"§) I do not see how this can be any argument in favour of its, "disuse," so long as its continuance was commanded of God. But as you have admitted that all our opinions must be brought to the "test of the sacred book," we will cast the opinions of the learned to the moles and to the bats, and confine ourselves entirely to it. This no one may touch, without subjecting himself to the most dreadful punishment. Witness the example of Uzzah, who put forth his hand to support the ark, the symbol of God's presence.‖ Though his motive might have been pure, yet, as he was included among those who were commanded not to come nigh it,¶ it was presumption in him to

* Mark vii. 9. 13. † John xv. 23. ‡ Luke vi. 40.
§ Page 74. ‖ 2 Sam. vi. 7. ¶ Num. xviii. 22.

touch it, and his temerity was punished on the spot. "The poor," said our Lord, "have the gospel preached to them,"* which is an unquestionable proof that they were, as the poor still are, able, independent of the aid of learned authors, to comprehend it: "the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein."†

The Lord does not now visit acts of disobedience with visible displays of his anger, as he did under the old dispensation, when, in marked violations of the holy law, the transgressors, as a warning to their brethren, either suffered immediate death, or had judgment openly pronounced against them. At present, to all outward appearance, the obedient and disobedient are alike the objects of his care; "for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good; and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust;"‡ and saith, "Let both grow together until the harvest."§ Yet, although we have not any signal warnings, as of old, "we have a more sure word of prophecy, whereunto we do well that we take heed."‖ And if we err, by taking an erroneous view of it, and die "with a lie in our right hand," we shall, when it is too late to retrace our steps, discover that we have only ourselves to blame.

To render a thing *nearly* indisputable is but a poor way, after all, of proving the correctness of it. Still, as you admit that "the baptism of proselytes is nowhere expressly mentioned in the Old Testament," will you not also admit, that if the Jews did baptize them, they committed an illegal, a superstitious, and a supererogatory act? Nor can we for a moment suppose, that the Lord of life and glory, who came to redeem his people, would commence his ministry by sanctioning such an innovation. Paul, his ambassador, said, "Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new."¶

I think you will not deny that Peter, while he was instructing Cornelius and his friends, was under the immediate influence of the Holy Ghost; nor that the Holy Ghost fell on them, before the "due time," in order to convince Peter that there was then no difference between Gentile and Jew. Now, it was from that circumstance that Peter, being still under the influence of the Holy Ghost, which he could not "withstand," "commanded them to be baptized (in water), in the name of the Lord."**

"On the supposition, therefore," you say, "that the ceremonies

* Matt. xi. v. † Isa. xxxv. 8. ‡ Matt. v. 45.
§ Matt. xiii. 30. ‖ 2 Peter i. 19.
¶ 2 Cor. v. 17. ** Acts x. 34—48.

of water baptism and the eucharist are truly of christian origin, yet, being shadows and types, and nothing more, they perfectly resemble the ordinances of the Jewish law, and plainly appertain to the principle of the old covenant. But further, on a fair examination of the history of these ceremonies, we find that they not only appertain to the *principle* of the old covenant, but were practices observed on that principle by the Jews themselves, before the introduction of the christian revelation. Thus, then, it appears that they actually formed a part of the ritual system of Judaism itself; and since it is on all hands allowed, that the whole of that ritual system, although observed for many years after the death of Jesus by most of his immediate disciples, is nevertheless null and void under the christian dispensation, we appear to be brought to a sound conclusion that, in connexion with the worship of christians, *the ceremonies in question are rightly disused.*"*

Allow me to ask, sir, is it candid, or just, or christian, to assume certain things as facts, and then proceed to argue from the assumptions; especially when your "observations" are for the instruction and "use of the junior branches of your society"? In other words, is it not to draw their tender minds from the truth, as it is revealed in the word of God? From the scrupulous manner in which your work is written, the reader might imagine that you have doubts of the correctness of your own statements; and that, when you were writing the following paragraph, you were unwittingly portraying your own case.

"It is not to be forgotten, that *the human imagination is very active and very delusive,* and that persons who are superficial in religion, or who are not sufficiently watchful, may sometimes mistake the unauthorised dictates of their own minds for the voice of a divine and unerring guide."†

I cannot see, sir, upon what principle your readers are to understand that the ceremonies are rightly disused; nor, on the supposition that they are truly of christian origin, on what principle they are made null and void under the christian dispensation; nor, being of christian origin, on what principle they can possibly appertain to a Jewish covenant, established nearly two thousand years previously; nor, even if the New Testament ordinances had been of Mosaic origin, and the continuance of them had been commanded of the Son of God, upon what principle they could by a christian be

* Page 78. † Page 44.

"*disused.*" What were once christian ordinances, must always be christian ordinances.* Our Lord instructed his disciples to teach all nations to observe all things that he had commanded them;† promising that "the Comforter, which is the *Holy Ghost,*" should teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance, whatsoever he had said unto them.‡ And John says, "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him."§

You have virtually admitted, sir, that it cannot be proved by the Old Testament that baptism was one of its ordinances; and by this admission you have deprived yourself of all ground for denying that it is a New Testament institution, and administered for the first time by "John the Baptist;" and yet you can be so inconsistent as first to give man for your authority, and then turn round and tell us,‖ that "it (Matt. xxiii. 8—12,) indirectly inculcates the general doctrine, that in matters of religion, christians are not to depend upon the teaching and authority of their fellow-men, but rather upon those of the Father and of Christ. They must, in this respect, be careful to set up neither themselves nor others."

The last paragraph is sound and scriptural doctrine, and I will put it to yourself, sir, if our Lord did not directly imply, (Matt. xxi. 25,) that the baptism of John was from heaven, and that it was a new institution; and if he did not,¶ after eating the last passover with his disciples, there and then institute the supper, and command them to celebrate it, in remembrance of him, so long as the world should stand. And you must excuse my putting a question or two; Can you conscientiously, in the face of the above passages, "come to a *sound* conclusion that, in connexion with christian worship, the ceremonies are *rightly* disused"? Can you, in the face of your own doctrine, forbid those in connexion with you from meeting together to read the scriptures, from which alone the teaching of the Father and of the Son can be known?**

The supper was instituted for an incomparably greater purpose than that for which the passover was instituted. The latter was to keep in the remembrance of a peculiar people their temporal deliverance from Egyptian bondage; while the former is to keep in the remembrance of the saints the death of Christ, through whom they

* See Rev. xxii. 18, 19. † Matt. xxviii. 20. ‡ John xiv. 26.
§ 1 John ii. 4. ‖ Page 317. ¶ Luke xxii. 14—20.
** See John v. 39, 46; Matt. xi. 27; Acts xvii. 11.

obtain eternal deliverance from the bondage of Satan; for, when all shall be gathered before the throne of judgment, the sins of the wicked shall be visited upon them, while the sins of the righteous shall, through the blood of Jesus Christ, the Lamb of God, be passed over; and they "shall go away into life eternal."*

Another passage demands attention; "As friends have been much impressed with the inefficacy of sacrificial rites and other formal ordinances; so have they been led to direct a very particular attention to the several branches of *moral duty* which are inculcated in this passage of scripture (Micah vi, 6—8);† and which, under the gospel dispensation, are unfolded, and *required* in their true perfection."†

Moral duties, sir, are especially required of the christian, "as a perfect rule of conversation, though not as a covenant to give life." But valuable as they are in themselves, they are, as respects the salvation of man, "beggarly elements:" to "walk humbly with God," inculcates inexpressibly higher things. In fact, we may say that the few words contained in the above texts embody almost every christian precept. Our Lord says, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven;"‡ the meaning of which I presume to be, that we cannot attain to that kingdom, unless we humble ourselves, and receive the truths of the New Testament with a willing mind, and as free from prejudice as a child receives its first rudiments of instruction.

It is said, "I will give them one heart, and I will put a new spirit within you; and I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them an heart of flesh. That they may walk in my statutes, and keep mine ordinances, and do them; and they shall be my people, and I will be their God."§ Again, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."‖ Now, sir, attention to baptism and the supper is most prominently commanded. To enter the church of Christ by the former, and to observe the latter within it, are the first outward evidences of a humble walk with God. It is true both ordinances are of themselves inefficacious; nevertheless, as they are typical of spiritual blessings, they are, when observed in faith, the beginning of the fulfilment of all righteousness,¶ and the threshold of the kingdom

* Matt. xxv. 46.
† Page 301.
‡ Matt. xviii. 3, 4.
§ Ezek. xi. 19, 20.
‖ Rev. xxii. 14.
¶ Matt. iii. 15.

of heaven. Yet high and important as these ordinances are; and although they are positive precepts, commanded by him whom even *you* denominate "the High Priest of our profession," to be observed by every believer, so long as time endures; you denounce them as "formal rites." I do not find it anywhere mentioned in the New Testament, that, after the ascension of our Lord, the *whole* of the Mosaic ritual was observed by most, or even by any, of the disciples of Christ. Some parts of it they did occasionally observe, merely as being expedient *for the moment*, to conciliate the Jews; for which purpose, indeed, Paul circumcised Timothy, the rite itself being innocent; but when the false brethren insisted upon the observance of the act as a matter necessary to salvation, he withstood them, and refused to circumcise Titus. He also withstood Peter, because that apostle refused to eat with the Gentiles, fearing those which were of the circumcision; for which Paul rebuked him before all present, saying, "If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."* When we consider that the ancient form of worship was ordained by God himself, we may conceive how hard it must have been for the Jewish converts to give up at once all the rites and ordinances to which they had been so long accustomed; but it is difficult to conceive a reason why the people of the present day should cleave with so much tenacity to the various forms of worship instituted by man.

It is evident that when our Lord said, "It is finished," the Jewish dispensation was abolished; and that when the temple was destroyed, all former rites and ceremonies ceased, because there was then no place in which to observe them Therefore, by contending that baptism and the supper appertained to that dispensation, and consequently ought to be disused, you are sitting in judgment upon Him who commanded their observance; thus verifying your own statement, "that the dictates of the Spirit, which lead into truth, are totally distinct from the dictates of the human imagination, which lead to enthusiasm."†

Again; you say, "If the *possibility* of an entrance into the kingdom of heaven, which a multitude of moral sins does not preclude, is precluded by the infraction of a merely positive precept, and by the omission of a rite *in itself* absolutely indifferent, it may almost be asserted that the system of christianity is overturned, and that the gospel falls to the ground."‡

* See Gal. ii. † Page 56. ‡ Pages 80, 81.

A positive precept, sir, embodies the will of God, as it is expressed in that precept; and it is that circumstance which gives it its commanding power. No man can now be saved, as the Old Testament saints were saved; they all died under the old dispensation. "He taketh away the first, that he might establish the second."* Our Lord, after he rose from the grave, established "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." And this baptism was taught and exemplified by Peter, and the other apostles, on the day of Pentecost;† those, therefore, who reject or neglect the ordinance which he commanded to be observed, have no more right to look for acceptance through him, than had the pharisees and lawyers, who, in the days of his flesh, "rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him."‡ In my former letter, I expressed an opinion that the salvation of the thief on the cross was an exception to the general rule of baptism being essential to salvation; but now I wish it to be understood that in that particular I was governed more by the opinions of men, than by the teaching of the scriptures. Further and more deliberate study of the word of God has convinced me to the contrary; I now see that it was previous to the completion of the old dispensation, and before the will of God was, by the baptism of the Spirit, fully revealed in the new, that the thief received the assurance of his salvation. I do not find in the gospel, after that the Lord had published his commission, the most remote implication of the salvation of any unbaptized individual. I therefore conclude, and conclude advisedly, that the thief was saved after the manner of the aged Simeon, and of Anna, who had seen Christ, but might not have lived long enough to confess him, after the manner of those believers who by baptism entered into the kingdom of heaven § I now therefore retract what I previously wrote, and assert that the salvation of the thief is no exception to the general requirement of baptism.

That John also died under the old dispensation is evident, from what our Lord said of him; "Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist. Notwithstanding, he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he."‖

It is by believing in Christ "to the saving of the soul," and by manifesting that belief in the ordinance of baptism, that the

* Heb. x. 9. † Acts ii. 14. 38. 41. ‡ Luke vii. 30.
§ See Luke ii. 29, 30. 37, 38. ‖ Matt. xi. 11.

multitude of our sins are pardoned, and that the door of salvation is opened for our admittance. "He that believeth, *and* is baptized, shall be saved."

You appear to argue, sir, because a multitude of sins do not preclude us from the kingdom of heaven, that therefore the omission of this ordinance can have no greater effect, and consequently that it may be dispensed with. Now, although sin does not preclude us from the kingdom of heaven, yet sin unrepented of does; and seeing that repentance independent of baptism is unavailable, it follows that both baptism and repentance are required of all who would enter therein.* It is true that the baptism of an individual does not prove him to be a christian; yet no individual is scripturally entitled to that character, until he has been baptized.† Do you not, sir, in the paragraph we are upon, imply that you yourself regard baptism and the supper to be "truly of christian origin"? and if so, I cannot see upon what ground you can conscientiously argue that they ought not to be observed.

The jealousy of the Most High with respect of every one of his precepts under the old dispensation, is exemplified in the following instances:—A man of God was charged by the Lord, while on an errand, to "eat no bread, nor drink water, nor turn again by the same way that he came,"—things of themselves, at any other time, "absolutely indifferent." But the charge was to him, until his errand was finished, a *positive precept*. In opposition to the direct commandment of God, he followed the counsel of his fellow-man; he ate and drank, and was about to return by the way that he came; but what was the consequence? Death!!‡

In Lev. xxv. 4, it is said, "the seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land, a sabbath for the Lord; thou shalt neither sow thy field, nor prune thy vineyard." Here is a standing positive precept, a precept which was to last as long as the Mosaic economy lasted; yet the Jews set it at nought; and observe what followed: the Lord "brought upon them the king of the Chaldees, who slew their young men with the sword,... and had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old man or him that stoopeth for age; he gave them all into his hand,... and them that had escaped from the sword carried he away to Babylon, where they were servants to him and to his sons;... to fulfil the word of the Lord,... until the land had enjoyed her sabbaths; for as long as she lay desolate she

* Mark i. 4, 14, 15; Acts ii. 38. † See Acts xi. 21, 26. ‡ See 1 Kings xiii.

kept sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years."* From the latter passage we may conclude that the Jews had lived in the neglect of that precept for four hundred and ninety years; and that, however long the Lord may forbear with a rebellious people, he will eventually either visit their rebellion on their own heads, or on the heads of their descendants, who continue to walk in their footsteps. Nor can we scripturally presume that God is less jealous now for that great and leading ordinance, baptism,—which was instituted by himself, and which was also fulfilled and established by his well-beloved Son,—than he was of old "for "Jerusalem and for Zion."†

"Woe to the rebellious children, saith the Lord, that take counsel, but not of me, and that cover with a covering, but not of my Spirit, that they may add sin to sin."‡ "To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry."§ The observance of any form of worship prescribed by man is rebellion against God; a continuance in that rebellion is stubbornness, and stubbornness is *idolatry*. Nor can there be any difference in the sight of God, between the manner of worship which is directly opposed to his will, and the idolatry of the heathen; save that the heathen, who has not the scriptures for his guide, has consequently much less to answer for.‖

You yourself, sir, acknowledge,¶ "that nothing is so expedient, nothing so desirable, nothing so *necessary*, either for individuals or for nations, as a conformity in point of conduct with the revealed will of the supreme Governor of the universe." But how do you act? The tendency of your "observations" is to instil into the minds of the young that there is a something in their own bosoms which you call "the inward monitor," that is paramount to that revealed will. Allow me to say, that your "observations" are at variance with the whole system of christianity; consequently, you make "the word of God of none effect through your tradition."** Nevertheless, however your society, and the majority of the world, may despise and reject the precepts of Christ, it is out of their power to suppress them, or to overturn the doctrines that he has established. The Lord has always a seed to serve him;†† and let it be never so thinly scattered, it will through his blessing fructify, and be sufficient

* 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17—21. † See Zech. i. 14; viii. 2, 3. ‡ Isa. xxx. 1.
§ 1 Sam. xv. 22, 23. See Jer. iii. 6—11, and Luke xii. 47, 48.
¶ Page 295. ** Mark vii. 13. †† Psalm xxii. 30; Amos ix. 8.

to maintain the gospel in its purity, and to preserve the earth,* until He shall come whose "right it is."

But I pass on to another passage. "We may conclude, therefore, that all in every age who should believe in Jesus were to receive, as well as the apostles themselves, the baptism of the Holy Ghost. Such, it is expressly declared, was the case with Cornelius and his family; (Acts xi. 15, 16,) and such undoubtedly must be the case with every christian, whether more or less *gifted*, who is converted and sanctified by the powerful influence of divine *grace*. Now the general doctrine to be deduced from the declarations thus made, both by the Baptist and by our Saviour, (John i. 32. 34; Acts i. 5,) may be explicitly stated in a few words: it is, first, that the baptism which properly appertained to the dispensation of John, and which *distinguished it from christianity*, was the *baptism of water;* and, secondly, that the baptism which properly appertains to christianity, and which distinguishes it from the dispensation of John, is the *baptism of the Spirit*."†

We generally speak but of two dispensations, the old and the new; but you make an intermediate one, *the dispensation of John*. According to the evangelist Mark, the baptism of John was "the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ."‡ "And it came to pass in those days that Jesus came from Nazareth... and was baptized of John in Jordan." Here then, at the very first preaching of the gospel, and by the example of the Son of God, we are shown the mighty importance of the ordinance; seeing that he who came to baptize his people with the Holy Ghost, was not himself baptized with it until after he had been baptized in water. It was whilst he was coming up out of the water, that "the heavens opened, and the Spirit, like a dove, descended upon him.§ If, then, the inward monitor, which you say "leads you out of the practice of this rite," be the Spirit of truth, then the scriptures are a fable, and the followers of Christ are groping "for the wall like the blind," and "are in desolate places as dead men."‖ But the passages just quoted show your "monitor" to be a false spirit, a phantom of your own creating, a thing that will not stand the "refiner's fire," but which "the hail shall sweep away."¶ This, sir, you may deem strong language, but your observations require rebuke, and merit remonstrance.

* Matt. v. 13. † Page 89. ‡ Mark i. 1. § Mark i. 9—11.
‖ Isa. lix. 10. ¶ See Isa. xxviii. 15—18. ** Page 272.

Referring to Matt. xi. 11, you say,** "But although John the Baptist was engaged in proclaiming the *approach* of the christian dispensation, the kingdom of heaven, he did not himself appertain to that kingdom;* he belonged to the preceding institution, and his moral system was that of the law."

Our Lord and John were born into the world nearly at the same time; they both baptized with water; and until both were cut off, the ordinances of the law, and the ordinance of the gospel, (baptism,) were simultaneously practised. And it was necessary that they should have been so practised, for our Lord came into the world to fulfil the law, as well as to begin and establish the gospel; but he did not baptize with the Spirit until after his ascension. It is unquestionable that John, like our Lord, had passed through all the Jewish ceremonies,† and that John assisted "to give knowledge of salvation unto his people, by the remission of their sins."‡ He must therefore have been, and was, like his Master,§ a preacher of the gospel; and, with the exception of his Master, one of the greatest men, if not the greatest of them, that had then been born of women. Yet, though it is said he was filled with the Holy Ghost, he was not, after the manner of those who survived the ascension, baptized with it.‖ Therefore, as he did not live to see the completion of the kingdom of Christ on the earth, he was less than the least of those who did live to see it, and who participated in its wonderful powers. Thus, though he had baptized his Lord, and confessed and shown him to be the Messiah, it could not literally be said of him that he was of the kingdom; but that, after the manner of Zacharias, his father, he was a partaker of its saving benefits.

Again; you say,¶ quoting John i. 32—34, "Such is the contrast drawn by John, between his own baptism and the baptism of Christ. The one is with water, and merely external; the other is with the Spirit and fire, internal and powerful. The one is the work of man, and, like the minister who practised it, is 'of the earth earthly;' the other is *divine*, the work of the eternal Son of God, who came from heaven, and 'is above all.'"**

It is easy to be discerned why you quoted from John, in preference to Matthew, Mark, and Luke. These three mention the circumstance in nearly the same words; but then it is in connexion with the water baptism of our Lord, in which connexion it is not mentioned by John. By quoting him therefore, in preference to

* Matt. xi. 11. † Luke i. 59. ‡ Luke i. 77.
§ See Matt. iv. 23. ‖ See John vii. 39. ¶ Page 88. ** John iii. 31.

the others, you lead the young to believe that he favours your peculiarities. Nevertheless, you show yourself to be a much bolder man than the chief priests and elders;* you declare positively that John's baptism was of the earth, earthly; the work of men. This they dared not for their lives declare, because they were convinced to the contrary. They knew who he was that put the question to them, and in what an awful dilemma they were placed. If they had spoken the truth, and said, "From heaven," the Lord would have answered, "Why did ye not then believe him?" But if they had uttered a falsehood, and said, "Of men," the people would have stoned them, "for all held John as a prophet."

But although John did contrast his own baptism with that of Christ Jesus, it was with the baptism that Christ administered after his ascension, not with that which he administered simultaneously with himself. For the baptism in water, which John and the Lord preached and practised, were one and the same—the "baptism of repentance."†

You "conclude,‡ that all in every age who should believe in Jesus, were to receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost"—those who are "sanctified by the powerful influence of divine *grace*." And by putting grace in italics, you mean doubtless to imply that baptism in water is not a requisite, and endeavour to prove it by quoting Acts xi. 15, 16. But these two solitary verses of themselves prove no more than that Cornelius and his friends had received the Spirit, though not at what time. Neither does the following passage, which you quote,§ from the preceding chapter, make anything in your favour; "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons;" *but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him.*‖ Italics again, and doubtless for the same purpose!

You have been most unfortunate, sir, in the attempt to support your peculiarities by extracts selected from the preceding chapters. In the whole Book, there are no two chapters so condemnatory of them. They show that the argument you employ for the "disuse" of the ordinance, is the very argument which the apostle Paul employs to enforce its use. In your view, the baptism which appertains to christianity, is the baptism of the Spirit: now Cornelius and his friends had already received that baptism, and it was for

* Matt. xxi. 25—27. † Matt. iii. 1, 2, and iv. 17; Mark i. 4. 15.
‡ Page 89. § Page 8. ‖ Acts x. 34, 35.

that very reason that Peter commanded them to be baptized in water, which baptism you denominate antichristian.

In the verse which follows the two you quote, Peter says, "Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as he did unto us, who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I that I could withstand God?"* As though he had said, Could I, with indisputable proof before me that these men had been baptized with the Holy Ghost, refuse to baptize them with water, and afterwards to sit down with them at the Lord's table—men to whom I was expressly sent by the Spirit, to teach and induct them into the church of God?" After the above manner Peter pleaded before the brethren, when they of the circumcision contended with him at Jerusalem for going in to the uncircumcised, and eating with them. The following are the particulars of the transaction: "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word; and they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." In every other instance, save that of Paul, the baptism of the Spirit was consequent on the baptism of water. The baptism, therefore, of Cornelius and his friends, affords sufficient evidence of the ordinance being of such a positive nature as to exclude any exception. Nor can it be upright, or ingenuous, or manly in you, nor does it indicate the part of a christian, that while you profess that your "volume is intended for the use of your junior members," and especially while you forbid their assembling to search the scriptures and judge for themselves,—to argue from part of a narrative, which when isolated may appear to favour your peculiarities, but which, when taken as a whole, condemns them, in language which can neither be gainsaid nor misunderstood. Thus, sir, you premeditately warp the young mind,—I say premeditately, because you must have been familiar with the whole of the passage; your inward monitor could not have prompted you to skip over all that is contained between Acts x. 35, and Acts xi. 15. If you would but put it to your conscience, sir, and ask, why you omitted to quote Acts x. 44—48, and seriously attend to its answer, that answer must, as a

* Acts xi. 17.

natural consequence, plant a seed of disquietude in your bosom that would germinate in spite of your peculiarities, and that nothing but the *genuine* grace of God would be able to root up. For how do you now stand in the sight of your Maker,—you who "are constrained to acknowledge that the *future* welfare of an individual man is of greater importance than the present and merely temporal prosperity of a whole nation.*

You use the expression "eternal Son," for which you have no authority in the scriptures. In no one place in them can you find either the expression "eternal Son," or that of "eternal Father." No, nor can you in the Old Testament find even the word "Father," as relating to Christ Jesus, but where he is spoken of prospectively.† Thus it is prophetically said, "Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee."‡ Before he was begotten, he could not have been a proper personal character; but by being born, he became "the word made flesh," manifesting, in our nature, the wisdom, power, grace, truth, life, and fulness of God.§ Now although he is said to be "the first-born of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth," &c.,‖ yet he could only have been the "first-born" in the mighty purpose and counsel of God:¶ for notwithstanding it is said, All things were created by him, it is also said, "By the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth."** "In the beginning," says John, "was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made."†† Now all these are only different forms of expression, designed to convey to our minds what is embodied in the following sentences; "He spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast."‡‡

"Now," you say,§§ "as men participate in the disease arising from the sin of Adam, who are totally ignorant of its original cause, so we may with reason infer that men may also participate in the remedy arising from the obedience of Christ, who have received no outward revelation whatever respecting that obedience. The inference deduced

* Page 292. † See Psalm lxxxix. 26, 27. ‡ Psalm ii. 7.
§ See John i. 14; 1 Cor. i. 30; 2 Cor. v. 19; Col. i. 19; Col. ii. 9; 1 Tim. iii. 16.
‖ Col. i. 15—17. ¶ See Prov. viii. 22, 23. 30; and Psalm xxxiii. 11.
** Psalm xxxiii. 6. †† John i. 1—3. See also Heb. xi. 3; 2 Pet. iii. 5.
‡‡ Psalm xxxiii. 9. §§ Page 8.

from these premises appears to derive, from certain passages in the New Testament, substantial confirmation. However Cornelius, the Roman centurion, previously to his communication with Peter, might have been aware of the events recorded in the gospel histories, it is obviously improbable that he knew Jesus Christ as the 'Redeemer of men;' yet that he had received the gift of the Spirit of grace is indisputable, for he was a '*just man, living in the fear of God.*'"*

Sir, although men may participate in diseases, without being acquainted with the original cause, it is impossible they can participate in the remedy, until they know where the remedy is to be found, and until they experience its healing effects: so in spiritual things, none can be saved, but through his own personal knowledge of Christ.† For the Lord says, "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing which is gone out of my lips."‡ It is not possible, then, that those who have received no outward revelation can arrive at that knowledge. All who die in ignorance of his character, must be raised in ignorance of it.§ That Cornelius knew something of the character of our Lord before sending for Peter is evident from the declaration of the latter;‖ but not to the "saving of the soul." It was by the preaching of Peter, that the "eyes of his understanding" were enlightened; and while Peter was yet speaking, "the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word." Then it was that Peter said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" &c. Now, sir, if you had been an upright and impartial commentator on the word of God, you would have noticed these things.

But you go on to say,¶ "It is true that the mercy of God towards Cornelius was displayed after a particular manner, in his being brought to the outward knowledge of his Saviour; but before he was introduced to that outward knowledge, he was accepted of the Father; and had he died in his condition of comparative ignorance, we can scarcely doubt that he would have received, with all the children of God, his eternal reward, through the merits of the mediation of Christ."

But why, sir, did you not show what that particular manner was? His being called of the Father was the very reason why he was instructed by the angel to send for Peter, why Peter was expressly sent by the Spirit to him, and why the Holy Ghost fell on him

* Acts x. 22. † Isa. liii. 11. ‡ Psalm lxxxix. 34.
§ Eccl. xi. 3. ‖ See Acts x. 36. 38. ¶ Page 9.

before the due time. This was done expressly to convince Peter that he was accepted of God, and prepared by him to be baptized in water. Before you attempt to prove that Cornelius would have been saved had none of these means been used, you must produce a sound scriptural reason why the Divine Being, in this instance, departed from his usual course, in order to accomplish them; and why, if the means were not essential to his salvation, they were used at all. "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure: they stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness. He sent redemption unto his people; he hath commanded his covenant for ever."*

The Creator of the universe could, by an act of sovereignty, have pardoned Adam, without the gift of his well-beloved Son, to make an atonement for him and his descendants. But he never pardons at the expense of any of his attributes; and such an act of pardon as this would have compromised his justice, and rendered void his own sentence, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." So, in like manner, he could have saved Cornelius, or any other of his creatures, without the outward knowledge, as you term it: but not without infringing his own institution, as established by his well-beloved Son,† whose kingdom is established "with judgment and with justice."‡ What is stated of Cornelius and his friends corroborates what the apostle Paul wrote to the Philippians, § "He which hath begun a good work in you, will perform it until the day of Jesus Christ."

Again, you state || that, "on a general view, therefore, of the passages in which the apostle (Paul) makes any doctrinal allusion to this subject (baptism), we may fairly conclude, that the only baptism of importance in his view was that of the Spirit; and that it was exclusively to this inward work that he intended to direct the attention of his readers, when he expressed himself as follows: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, ONE BAPTISM."¶

I cannot admit this conclusion. I think it is obvious that it was to the outward walk and conversation of the Ephesian converts that he directed their attention, when he addressed them as follows; "I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called; with all lowliness and meek-

* Psalm iii. 7—9. † Mark xvi. 15, 16. ‡ Isa. ix. 7.
§ Phil. i. 6. || Page 91. ¶ Ephes. iv. 5, 6.

ness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." "There is one body," the church; "one Spirit," by which the church is animated; "one hope," "the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;"* "one Lord," the Head of the church; "one faith," believing the same things; "one baptism,"† (that of water,) by which each individual believer is introduced into, and becomes a member of, the ONE BODY. As the word baptism stands here without any qualification, it must be taken in its literal sense; for I am not aware that the word is ever used metaphorically, without some qualification; and I must remind you, sir, that the individuals to whom these words were addressed had all been baptized with water.‡

The momentous promise of our Lord is comprised in the few following words; "He that believeth, *and* is baptized, shall be saved." Cornelius believed, and was baptized with the Spirit. But it is manifest this was not the baptism mentioned in the promise. If it were, Peter would not have commanded him to be baptized in water. Had the former sufficed, the Lord's promise would have been of none effect. This act of Peter's, therefore, shows that the Most High attaches as much importance to literal as to metaphorical baptism; otherwise why was Cornelius baptized with water, after he had been baptized with the Spirit?

Baptism with water, according to the regular order of the gospel, precedes baptism with the Spirit.§ The baptism of Cornelius was an exception to that order; which exception, having answered the intended purpose, none other exception can now be admitted. Seeing, then, that the baptism of the Spirit is consequent upon the antecedent baptism in water, what can make a difference in their importance; more especially as it is shown that, where the order was reversed, the being baptized first with the Spirit was given as a reason why Cornelius should be afterwards baptized with water?‖ And no individual, who has not been baptized both with water and the Spirit, can stand forward in defence of the gospel, and "say that Jesus is the Lord."¶

If baptism were not essential to Cornelius' salvation, then his baptism, as commanded by Peter, was an act of supererogation. And if it was essential to his salvation, the conclusion cannot be

* 2 Tit. ii. 13. † Ephes. iv. 1—5. ‡ Acts xix. 5. 10. 18.
§ Matt. iii. 11; Acts i. 5; ii. 38. ‖ Acts xi. 17. ¶ 1 Cor. xii. 3.

avoided, that it must be essential to that of every individual who comes to Christ, through faith in his promises; otherwise, there would be more than one gospel, and consequently more than one "way of salvation."

Again, it is said by our Lord, "John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."* In the next chapter, the fulfilment of this promise is recorded: "When the day of Pentecost was fully come,... there appeared unto them cloven tongues, as of fire, and sat upon each of them; and they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." Now, these individuals must have been literally baptized, during the time that our Lord was upon the earth;† for if the Head of the church could not be baptized with the Spirit, nor enter on his ministry, without being first baptized in water, it consequently follows that his disciples could not. Further down, in the second chapter, Peter says to those around him, "Repent, and be baptized; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

Again, when Paul was at Ephesus, he found certain disciples who had been baptized (like too many in our day), without knowing unto what they were baptized; but such baptism is spurious, and consequently a dead letter. "Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on on him which should come after him,—that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied."‡ Here, sir, we have, in their regular order, in the same persons, and at the same time, both the baptism in water and the baptism of the Spirit so distinctly exemplified, as to annihilate all cavilling and mystification; and, with such an instance as this on record, to mistake, or substitute one baptism for the other, or assert that the latter is the only baptism of importance, is a wilful perversion of the word of God. Add to this, the apostle has established the principle, that those who have been baptized in ignorance of the special import of the ordinance, or in other words, in unbelief,—*i. e.*, ere they were self-convinced of their hearts being opened of God,—must, if ever they are brought to "believe the gospel," be baptized on a confession of their faith, after the manner of any other

* Acts i. 5. † Matt. iii. 11; Acts i. 21, 22.
‡ Acts xix. 4—6.

convert, their former baptism having been, according to the gospel rule, no baptism whatever. This example of Paul's is sufficient authority for all ministers of Christ not to receive into their churches any of a similar description, without first baptizing them on a confession of faith; any other course, indeed, would involve a tacit acknowledgment that the baptism of an unbeliever is valid baptism. Now, sir, if, as you conclude, the only baptism of importance in Paul's view was that of the Spirit, I call upon you to state why he baptized these Ephesians in water, previous to his laying hands on them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. In the gospel, the "way of salvation" is clearly revealed; and the dreadful consequences to those who reject that way are revealed also; of them it is said, "For this cause (because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved,) God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie."*

Again, "Judging from the documents before me, I should say, that this well-known 'doctrine of baptisms' (one of those elementary principles of truth which were familiar even to the babes in Christ),† must have been nearly as follows: That, under the legal dispensation, divers carnal baptisms were observed by the Jews, as rites of purification;‡ that among those rites was numbered the *baptism on conversion*, a ceremony to which the Israelites themselves submitted, on their original entrance into the covenant of the law,§ and which was afterwards invariably practised, on the admission of the proselytes of justice to the character and privileges of the native Jew;‖ that, under divine authority, this *baptism on conversion* was applied by John to the peculiar purposes of his own ministry;¶ that these ancient Jewish baptisms were severally effected by washing or immersion in *water;* that they were all figures of another and a better baptism, by which christianity was distinguished from every preparatory dispensation, a baptism of which Christ is the Author, and his disciples in every age and country the objects; that this true christian baptism appertains not to the body, but to the soul, and is effected entirely by the power of the Holy Ghost; that by it we are regenerated or converted; sanctified, and saved from sin; and, finally, that without it no man can find an entrance into the mansions of eternal rest and glory.

* 2 Thess. ii. 10, 11. † Heb. v. 13, 14, and vi. 2.
‡ Heb. ix. 10. § Exodus xix. 14. ‖ John iii. 5. 10.
¶ John i. 32—34.

"We cannot fail to observe, that 'the doctrine of baptisms,' as it is thus unfolded on the authority of scripture, is exactly in accordance with that great principle of the divine law, ... namely, that under the last or christian dispensation, God is no longer to be worshipped through the old medium of ceremonies, shadows, and types, but simply and exclusively in *spirit and in truth*....

"That the participle 'baptizing,' as it is used in this passage,* is capable, on common philological principles, of being interpreted in its literal sense, as relating to an outward immersion, it would be at once uncandid and useless to deny. That persons in all ages of the christian church, who have been accustomed to regard that external rite as sacred, should adopt such an interpretation, can be no matter of surprise. And that those ministers of the gospel who, in conscientious conformity with the words of Christ, *according to their own view of them*, continue the practice of baptizing their converts in water, are no proper subjects of blame or condemnation, is to my apprehension equally evident. Nevertheless, it ought to be observed, that there is no mention made in the passage of *water*, nor anything whatsoever in the terms used which renders such literal interpretation imperative upon us. On the contrary, I am persuaded that a sound and impartial view of the various collateral points which throw light on the true meaning of our Lord's injunction, will lead us to a very different estimate of that meaning....

"It is indeed true, that the baptism of the Spirit is elsewhere attributed to Christ himself. Undoubtedly, it is a divine work; and he who properly causes it, and carries it into effect, is one participating in the nature and attributes of God. But originating, as it ever must originate, with our Divine Master, this baptism might, nevertheless, *be administered* by the instrumentality of his servants. Inasmuch as the apostles of Jesus Christ were enabled, through the efficacy of an inspired ministry, to turn away their hearers from idolatry and other sins, to introduce them to a state of comparative purity, and to convert them to the true faith, in so much did they possess the power to baptize, in a spiritual sense, unto the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. It appears to be on the same principle that Christ is described by the apostle Paul as applying to his own church the baptism of the Spirit; as sanctifying and cleansing it 'with the washing of water,' '*by the word*;' that is, probably, by the ministry of the gospel; Ephes. v.

* Matt. xxviii. 18—20.

26; compare Rom. x. 17, Ephes. vi. 17. 'The preaching of the cross,' when prompted and dictated by the Holy Spirit, is often found to be 'the power of God.'* The ministers of the gospel ought, however, always to remember, that they can administer the baptism of the Spirit only through the power of their Lord and Saviour; and in their humble efforts to comply with so sacred an injunction, they must derive their encouragement from that gracious promise with which it was accompanied, '*Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.*'"†

You admit,‡ that the baptism of proselytes is nowhere expressly mentioned in the Old Testament, and your quoting Exodus xix. 4, confirms your admission; for if you could have found a passage more favourable to your views, you would most certainly have brought it forward. And what says this solitary passage? "Moses went down from the mount unto the people, and they washed their clothes." Is there, sir, in this act, the shadow of a resemblance to the baptism of John, as illustrated in his baptism of our Lord? Admit that the Jewish baptisms were effected by washing or immersion in water, still, until it can be shown that washing and immersion are synonymous terms, it will not help your cause. By your own admission, negatively it is true, baptism must have been a new institution, when first administered by John. And our Lord, after his resurrection, confirmed and established it. And I cannot conceive a greater encouragement to the genuine observance of it, than the glorious promise consequent upon its observance: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved."

I have before shown, that during the time of the apostles, with two exceptions, the baptism of the Spirit was consequent on the baptism in water; and that in both exceptions, the baptism of the Spirit was immediately followed by that of water. The design of one of the exceptions is obvious; it was to convince Peter that Cornelius was a chosen vessel, prepared to confess his Lord in baptism, and that all distinctions between Jew and Gentile had ceased. The other doubtless was, to satisfy Ananias that Saul, the former persecutor of the church, was likewise so prepared. While they combine to teach that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom Paul was, according to his own confession, chief. These two things, then, being thus fully established, it naturally follows that the baptism of the Spirit must, so long as the world shall continue,

* 1 Cor. i. 18. † Pages 94—99. ‡ Page 74.

be consequent on the baptism in water.* How then, let me ask, can any one who sets at nought the ordinance of baptism in water, expect to be baptized with that of the Spirit, without which latter baptism, according to your own declaration even, none can enter into the mansions of eternal glory?

I presume, sir, that your quoting Heb. v. 13, 14, and vi. 1, was to convince the young that the doctrine of baptisms was only adapted to babes, *i. e.*, to the state of things under the old dispensation, or to John's converts; but that strong meat was adapted to those who, under the present dispensation, acknowledge no baptism but that of the Spirit. Does Paul argue that the doctrine of baptisms, of which he is speaking, belonged to the old dispensation, and as such was to be discontinued? Was he not reproving the Hebrews for negligence, as if they had almost forgotten even "the first principles of the oracles of God"?† In these things they ought to have been well grounded; and being well grounded in them, they were not to rest upon them — they were not all their life-time to be laying again the foundation of repentance and of faith; but, having once laid them, they were to carry up the building to perfection.‡ And, knowing that their sins were forgiven, they were to "press towards the mark, for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."§

I do not see that your quotation, John iii. 5—10, gives any support to the sentiment you attempt to uphold. Is not the expression, "born of water," symbolical?‖ It is by the written word, made clear to our understanding by the influence of the Spirit, that we are brought to the knowledge of God, and prepared to enter, by the ordained way,¶ into his church; or, in other words, into the kingdom of heaven. Now this way of entrance is figuratively represented by being born of "water," a birth of which Nicodemus was ignorant, and of which numerous professors at the present day know nothing. Neither do I clearly see your drift in quoting John i. 32. 34, except it be to show that baptism in water was to cease when the baptism of the Spirit commenced. But this is contrary to "the truth." For Peter, the same day, after he had been baptized with the Spirit, preached the baptism of repentance; and on that same day three thousand converts were baptized in water. John had no ministry of his own. He was sent expressly "from God...

* See Acts ii. 38, 39; xix. 5, 6; Eccl. iii. 14; Gal. iii. 15.
† Heb. vi. 1. ‡ Heb. vi. 1. § See Phil. iii. 3—16.
‖ Eph. v. 26; 1 Peter i. 23. ¶ Matt. xxiii. 19, 20.

to bear witness of the light ... that all men through him might believe."*

To "worship God in spirit and in truth," sir, be assured, is something more than to worship him in "silence"—that negative manner which is the general practice of your sect. The entire book of the Psalms of David repudiates such worship. But this is authority to which perhaps you will object! Well, then, take for example our Lord's sermon on the mount—his teaching in the synagogue on the sabbath†—his baptism—his institution of the supper, and his directions for partaking of it—his singing a hymn‡—his prayers§—his commission||—and the manner in which his disciples followed his directions, "teaching and admonishing one another in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing with grace in their hearts to the Lord."¶ Surely these things are sufficient to guide the humble *christian* "into the way of peace." To worship God in spirit and in truth, then, according to the gospel, is to honour and obey him in all things, after the direction contained in his word; implicitly, even as a child obeys and honours its parents—not from fear, but from filial affection, fulfilling with a ready mind all his commands—not enquiring, nor questioning why they are laid upon him, but complying with cheerfulness, because they are his. It is constantly to study his word, with prayer for knowledge to comprehend his will, and for wisdom and strength to perform it. It is, when we are brought to know him, to separate ourselves from the world, to confess our sins, and to profess our faith before men in the ordinance of his institution, to receive the laying on of hands, and afterwards to partake of the supper. Until thus received into the church, none can, according to the scriptures, address the Most High as Father; as it is written, "Come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing; and I will receive you, and be a father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty."** "For through him," (Christ,) all which were afar off, and all which were nigh, have "access by one Spirit unto the Father."†† After being instructed in the "first principles" of the gospel, we are baptized. Thus we become children, and, leaving those first principles behind, we then become "young men," and "fathers," and "grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ."‡‡

* John i. 6, 7. † Luke xiii. 10. ‡ Matt. xxvi. 26—30. § Luke xxii. 42—44.
|| Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. ¶ Col. iii. 16. See also Eph. v. 19; Acts xvi. 25.
** 2 Cor. vi. 17, 18. †† Eph. ii. 18. ‡‡ Eph. iv. 15.

Those who receive the testimony of Christ as little children,—and such only he declares shall enter into the kingdom,—can put no other construction on the participle baptizing, as it occurs Matt. xxviii. 19, than that of immersing in water.* This construction you do not deny; on the contrary, you allow its validity. Upon what principle, then, can you turn round, and in the next breath assert that this construction, viewed in its various collateral points, is not in accordance with the text? And upon what principle is your charitable feeling extended to those who think differently? Do you advocate the preaching of more than one gospel?—a thing of all others which the apostle Paul most strongly denounces.† Or can it be one of your peculiarities to encourage error? For if baptism in water be not commanded of Christ, to practise it is an act of supererogation, and as such ought to be discontinued. A principal objection with you, but which to me appears a most puerile one, is, that there is no mention made of water. I do not see why there should be, when the eleven knew by practical demonstration what our Lord meant by the term "baptizing." Nay, the presumption may scripturally be entertained, that these eleven were the very men who had previously baptized in his stead,‡ and who were afterwards commanded to baptize in his name. This objection, then, comes with a very bad grace from you, who, in order to prove that baptism was a Jewish institution, quote a text§ in which there is no mention of water, nor the most distant allusion to baptism.

It is true, you afterwards say, "From the comparison of other similar passages, it appears probable that the washing of clothes here mentioned, Exod. xix. 10. 14, was a baptism or immersion of the whole body, together with the apparel. Compare Lev. xi. 25; xiv. 47; xv. 5, &c." Are you not desirous, sir, that we should infer from the above paragraph that the unclean person went down into the water with his clothes on?—a truly unique manner of washing his clothes together with his body; but what says the last passage you quote? Why, "that whosoever toucheth his bed shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water." Or, as it is in Lev. xiv. 8, 9, "He that is to be cleansed ... shall wash his clothes; *also* he shall wash his flesh in water." Two very distinct operations, neither of which gives to your peculiarities the least support.

Now, sir, collateral points prove that the literal meaning of the

* See John i. 31. † See Gal. i. 6—12. ‡ John iv. 2.
§ Exod. xix. 14.

word "baptizing," as it stands in the text, is immersing in water. John said, "I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."* And be it remembered, that John saw this as our Lord ascended up out of the water. Let it be remembered, also, that our Lord himself baptized with water, some years previously to his baptizing with the Spirit. As it is said, "After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, and there he tarried with them, and baptized."† While our Lord sojourned on the earth, He was the only person that was, according to "the promise of the Father,"‡ baptized with the Spirit; consequently, during that time his disciples could have had no other baptism than that of water; while the account which is recorded of the baptism of the eunuch by Philip proves the literal construction of the term baptizing to be the true one.

The collateral points,§ by which you endeavour to prove the contrary, are:—

1. "The peculiar solemnity of that parting moment, and the apparent improbability that, on *such* an occasion, a merely external ceremony should be so prominently insisted on.

2. "The method so often employed by Jesus, of conveying instruction and precept concerning spiritual things in words which bore an outward allusion to the flesh.‖

3. "The frequent occurrence of the terms, 'baptize,' and 'baptism,' in the New Testament, and particularly in the discourses of Christ himself, in a sense purely metaphorical.

4. "The abolition, under the new dispensation, of the whole Jewish ritual, and the substitution of a worship entirely spiritual.

5. "The evidence derived from so many other explicit passages of scripture, in favour of the doctrine that the baptism of christianity is the work of the Spirit only.

6. "The pointed manner in which Jesus himself, in a preceding part as is most probable of this very conversation, contrasted that efficacious influence, the privilege of his own followers, with the water baptism of John, Acts iii. 5. [qu. Acts i. 5.] All these are collateral circumstances, which bear with no slight degree of force on the passage before us, and which, when considered as a whole,

* John i. 33. † John iii. 22, 23. ‡ Acts i. 4.
§ Page 97. ‖ See John iii. 5; iv. 14—32; vi. 53; vii. 38.

appear to afford substantial evidence that the baptism, of which the use was thus prescribed to his apostles by the Redeemer of men, was simply and exclusively a *spiritual baptism*."

You have, sir, certainly, been at much pains to confound the gospel of Christ; but you must be well aware that the expressions, "apparent improbability," "as is most probable," "bearing with no slight degree," and "appear to afford," are not modes of speech the most propitious to enforce your argument; nay, on the contrary, do they not rather indicate that your peculiarities will not bear investigation?

The baptism of christianity, you say, is the work of the Spirit only. But how can this be? Did not John administer christian baptism to our Lord, previous to our Lord's being baptized with the Spirit by his Father? And were not both baptisms illustrative of his entering on the gospel ministry?* By the law of the New Testament, no man can now be baptized with the Spirit, before he is made a christian, by receiving genuine baptism with water. Therefore is it that christian baptism, although from heaven, is administered by man; while the baptism of the Spirit is administered by Christ alone.† Read, sir, Acts viii. 12—17; this narrative is of itself sufficient, not only to show that all your collateral points are irrelevant, but to overturn your statements altogether.

Who, in these days of the general diffusion of the scriptures, would have expected to meet with such a carnal doctrine as the following? "The ministers of the gospel can administer the baptism of the Spirit only through the power of the Lord and Saviour." This power, sir, the apostles themselves never possessed; it is the royal prerogative, the prerogative of the Most High,‡ who has never yet deputed it to any subject.

But, sir, it is useless for you to argue upon this matter; for your sect is altogether independent of the baptism of the Spirit. You say,§ "With Friends it is a leading principle in religion, a principle on which they deem it to be in a peculiar manner their duty to insist, that the operations of the Holy Spirit in the soul are not only immediate and direct, but perceptible; and that we are all furnished with an inward guide, or monitor, who makes his voice known to us, and who, if faithfully obeyed and closely followed, will infallibly conduct us into true virtue and happiness, because he leads us into a real conformity with the will of God." Now, sir, if, as you

* See Mark i. 9—11. 14.
† See Matt. iii. 11.
‡ John xiv. 16—18.
§ Page 37.

assert, all your society are furnished with such an inward Guide, and if, as you infer, those may be saved who never heard of the word, permit me to ask, Have not the heathen, seeing that all men come into the world alike,* the same inward guide? and have they not the same advantage as your society have? Nay, do not the Friends, who have the Word, according to Luke xii. 47, 48, place themselves in a worse position than the heathen, who have it not?

I fear, sir, the "humble efforts" you advocate, are something akin to the "voluntary humility" which Paul warns the Colossians to beware of, *i. e.*, "intruding into those things which man hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind."†

You denominate the Saviour of the world OUR Divine Master, while you are doing your utmost to decry his ordinances, and thus render void his gospel. To beware of false prophets, was his advice to "the multitude."‡

By your saying that the baptism of the Spirit is elsewhere attributed to Christ himself, surely you do not purpose to insinuate that the baptism mentioned in Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, is that baptism, when in the verse following it is added, "teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." Ere you can establish your peculiarities, sir, you must prove, not only that the apostles baptized with the Spirit, but that they taught others also to baptize with it. The commission is to baptize in water, in the name of, and not with, the Spirit; and the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," is to all that teach the truth, and to all that are taught of it—to every one "that believeth, and is baptized." The external ceremony which you refer to was the antitype of the passover, which was enjoined upon the Israelites to keep in mind their deliverance from temporal bondage: so the supper was instituted to keep in mind not only the deliverance from eternal bondage, but also the promised enjoyment of eternal liberty, with the unspeakable happiness which accompanies it.

What a most notable discovery you have made! that water is mentioned (Eph. v. 26,) in connexion with the word; although you observe, and truly, that it is not mentioned (Matt. xxviii. 19,) in connexion with baptism. By comparing the former text with Rom. x. 17, and Eph. vi. 17, you appear desirous to inculcate the doctrine that salvation is by *the word*. But is this all that you are desirous

* Job xxxi. 15. † Col. ii. 18. ‡ See Matt. vii. 15—29.

to inculcate? Do you not, by disingenuously dividing the text, Eph. v. 26, by inverted commas, and putting the last three words in italics, desire to inculcate that this text is nearly synonymous with that of Matt. xxviii. 19? Thence to throw a vail over baptism, it answers your purpose to lay stress upon "the word." But why, may I ask, is this? By your own showing, the word is only a secondary thing with you, since you infer,* that men may be saved who never heard of the word; in contradiction to the apostle Paul, who asserts that "the gospel of Christ... is the power of God to salvation."† "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that put darkness for light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter."‡

Now although "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God,"§ still something more than this faith is required of a believer. He is absolutely required, in accordance with the promise, to confess publicly that he has received it.‖ Our Lord says, "Whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven. But whosoever shall deny me, (*i. e.*, whosoever shall *not* confess me,) before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven."¶ "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh, is not of God."** And there is, in the first instance, no other way of confessing him than being on a confession of faith, baptized in water.

Combating the common courtesies of the world, you say,†† "That truth of speech, which in the Holy Scriptures is opposed to the lying tongue, and is so frequently, so clearly, and so earnestly enjoined, obviously consists in the honest and accurate conformity of our words (according to their acknowledged signification,) to facts and realities." And again;‡‡ "It may be justly contended that the use of words which, according to their *known signification* represent things untrue, constitutes a falsehood." Now, sir, will not these remarks apply strictly and justly to your own manner of wresting the scriptures, giving to words, as they stand in their proper places, a meaning quite out of conformity with their true one?

In remarking on Rom. ii. 13. 15, you say,§§ "Upon this striking

* Page 8. † Rom. i. 16. ‡ Isa. v. 20. § Rom. x. 17.
‖ See Acts viii. 37; Rom. x. 8—10; Phil. ii. 11. ¶ Matt. x. 32, 33.
** 1 John iv. 2, 3. †† Page 322. ‡‡ Page 323. §§ Pages 10—13.

and very lucid passage of scripture, it may be observed, first, that the law here mentioned is not the ceremonial law, as the whole tenor of the apostle's argument plainly evinces, but the moral law of God, which was outwardly revealed to the Jews, and was with still greater completeness unfolded under the christian dispensation. Secondly, that the Gentiles, here brought into a comparison with the Jews, were not those Gentiles who had been converted to christianity,... but they were Gentiles who had received no outward revelation whatever of the moral law of God. Thirdly, that the work of the law was nevertheless written on their hearts, and that many of them (according to the apostle's obvious supposition,) were thereby actually enabled to become doers of the law. And, lastly, that these persons were justified or accepted of the Father. Those who accede to this view of the passage before us, (and such a view is surely just and reasonable,) will probably find no difficulty in admitting this additional proposition; namely, that the work of the law, written on the hearts of these Gentiles, through which they were thus enabled to bear the fruits of righteousness, was nothing less than the inward operation of the Spirit of truth; for christianity plainly teaches us, that without such an influence there can be no acceptable obedience to the moral law of God....So the law written on the heart, although capable of being hindered in its operation, is of an unchangeable nature, and would guide *invariably* into righteousness and truth; but the conscience may be darkened by ignorance, deadened by sin, or perverted by an illusive education. The conscience, indeed, like every other natural faculty of the human mind, is *prone* to perversion, and the law written in the heart is given, not only to enlighten, but to rectify it. Those only have 'a good conscience' who obey that law."

Here, sir, you undisguisedly and unreservedly set before us the genuine doctrine of your denomination, that a knowledge of the scriptures is not essential to man's salvation—an open acknowledgment that what you denominate the "inward monitor," is the sheet-anchor of your hope; from which we may conclude that the only difference between quakerism and heathenism is, that the law written in the heart of the heathen is real, while that supposed to be written in the heart of the quaker is imaginary—the one dwelling in darkness of necessity, the other of choice. But what says the passage you quote? "When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the

law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another." Now, sir, what is the import of this passage: is it not this? The apostle is comparing the state of the natural Jew with the state of the heathen, and says, "For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law ... in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, by Jesus Christ, *according to the gospel.*" In these passages, there is no salvation whatever implied; on the contrary, the allusion is wholly to condemnation, a condemnation which will fall much less heavily on the heathen than on the Jews; for the latter knew, or might have known if they would, their Lord's will; but as they did not act in accordance with it, they shall be beaten with many stripes; while the former, not knowing the Lord's will, though they commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes; "for unto whomsoever much is given, of him shall be much required."* The state of the Jews, therefore, and of those who mangle the gospel, is more fearful than that of the heathen. But whose is the fault? Is it not their's, who, having an opportunity of knowing the Lord's will, do not embrace the opportunity? "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."†

By your tradition, you not only make the commandment of God, but the blood of Christ, of none effect. "For if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain."‡ You assert, and assert truly, that christianity plainly teaches us, that without the influence of the Spirit there can be no acceptable obedience to the moral law of God. Now comes the question, What is it that teaches christianity? It cannot be the law, for that is only "our schoolmaster, to bring us unto Christ;"§ unto him who assures all genuine christians that he will send unto them, from the Father, the Comforter, "even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father;"|| and that, "when he, the Spirit of Truth is come, he will guide you into all truth; for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and show you things to come."¶ Consequently, no man can come to Christ, but he that is taught of God;**

* Luke xii. 47, 48. † John iii. 19. ‡ Gal. ii. 16—21.
§ Gal. iii. 24. || John xv. 26. ¶ John xvi. 13. ** John vi. 44, 45.

And no man can be taught of God but by means of the gospel.* And this it is that teaches christianity! Alas, then, for the inward monitor, and for the law written in the heart of the heathen.

Again, you say,† "'He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.' Here the baptism to which our Lord is described as adverting is classed with *saving faith. It is the baptism which saves.* Now we are assured that the baptism which saves is 'not the putting away of the filth of the flesh,' nor any work of righteousness which we can perform for ourselves;‡ it is that birth of water and the Spirit which is 'from above,' and which prepares us for an entrance into the kingdom of heaven;§ it is 'the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ;'‖ it is 'the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost.'¶

"On a review of the various passages (those before) cited, many of my readers will probably agree with me in the sentiment, that there is no part of the New Testament in which the observance of baptism *in water* is either *commanded or declared to be necessary:* such being the case, I know of nothing which remains to be pleaded in support of that ceremony, as a part of the religious service of christians, but *the example of the apostles.* That many of the apostles were accustomed, both before and after the ascension of Jesus, to baptize their converts in water, is indeed rendered indisputable, by certain passages in the gospel of John, and in the book of Acts. But this fact by no means affords any sufficient evidence that the practice of a similar rite is universally imperative on the ministers of christianity. The entire spirituality of the new dispensation, the great principle that God was no longer to be served by the intervention of sacerdotal and typical institutions, but only through the mediation of the Son, and under the influence of the Holy Spirit, was very gradually unfolded to these servants of the Lord. It is notorious that many of them adhered with strictness to a great part of the Jewish ritual, long after it was abrogated by the death of Christ; and even on the Gentile converts they enjoined an abstinence from things strangled, and from blood...no less imperatively than from the sin of fornication.** It is true, that after they had ceased to recommend circumcision to the Gentiles, they continued to baptize them in water. But the reason of this distinction is plain, namely, that circumcision was the sign of an entrance into

* Rom. i. 16. † Page 99. ‡ Titus iii. 5. § John iii. 5.
‖ 1 Peter iii. 21. ¶ Titus iii. 5. ** Acts xv. 29.

the covenant *of the law*, but that baptism, although a Jewish practice, and observed on the principles of Judaism, was the type of conversion to christianity itself, and was therefore very naturally considered by the apostles as appropriate to the specific purposes of their own ministry. As long as they observed the ceremonies of Judaism in their own persons, as long as they continued unprepared for a full reception of the doctrine, that the ordinances and shadows of the law were now to be disused, and that God was to be worshipped in a manner entirely spiritual, so long would they, *as a matter of course*, persevere in the practice of baptizing their converts *in water*. Neither are we to imagine that in this respect the apostles acted in opposition to the will of their Divine Master, who appears to have imposed upon them no sudden change of conduct respecting ritual observances, but simply to have left them in possession of those great principles of spiritual religion, the tendency of which was to undermine all such observances at the very foundation, and thus in a gradual manner to effect their abolition."

Do you not, sir, wish it to be understood, that because baptism is classed with saving faith, "it is the baptism that saves," namely, the baptism which is from above?" And do you not designedly endeavour to hide the true sense of the passage, by quoting only a part it, and wresting that part in such a manner as to sanction your own peculiarities? See 1 Peter iii. 21; where Peter is comparing baptism with the ark, wherein eight souls were saved, and shews the latter to be a figure of the former. That as Noah, through faith, entered into the ark, and thus was saved from temporal death, so all that go down into the water, through faith in the atoning death of Christ—that are there typically buried with him in it—and that come up out of the water through faith in his resurrection, are saved from eternal death. Seeing that every individual perished who was not found in the ark, how can any survive who shall not be found in its antitype, the church, the only way of entrance into which is by baptism in water? And what man can possess "the answer of a good conscience towards God," while he, "rejecting the counsel of God against himself,"* remains an "alien from the commonwealth of Israel"?† "If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself, but if thou scornest, thou alone shalt bear it."‡

Whether your readers will agree with you in the sentiment, that in the gospel baptism in water is nowhere commanded or declared to

* Luke vii. 30. † Eph. ii. 12. ‡ Prov. ix. 12.

be necessary, you appear to be very doubtful, or you would not have introduced that ominous word "*probably.*" I am bold to say, that *no one* will, save he that follows the pernicious ways of false teachers, "by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of."* According to Matthew, Christ commanded his disciples to baptize all their converts; which baptism was one of the things to be observed as long as the world should continue.† And Mark declares baptism to be necessary to salvation, by saying, "He that believeth, AND is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." The meaning of the latter clause may be explained thus: as unbelief is the barrier to baptism, so the lack of baptism is the barrier to the promise, and consequently to salvation. There is no necessity whatever to urge any man who is truly seeking for salvation, and sees that there is salvation for him, to be baptized; because no one who understands the scriptures can expect to be saved while he puts the ordinance from him.‡ The necessity is rather to persuade the inexperienced, who may still be in darkness, from rushing into it "rashly," as many unhappily do, to their own destruction.§

After having thus quashed the commission of the Lord, by which the apostles were guided, you say, "nothing remains to be pleaded in favour of baptism but *their example*, which by no means affords sufficient evidence that the practice of it is universally imperative on the ministers of christianity."

This, sir, is a perilous conclusion. If the ministers of Christ are not to follow their example, whose example are they to follow? Were not the apostles ministers of Christ? and did not Christ say, I pray "for them also which shall believe on me through their word"?‖ And did not Paul, who was himself baptized, say to the Corinthians, "Be ye followers of me, even as I also am of Christ."¶ And was not Christ also baptized? Surely, then, the example of men who had "the mind of Christ,"** is as binding in all things as if they had been commanded of Christ; otherwise the whole gospel loses its authority, and becomes little better than a forgery. It is said, "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps,"†† *i. e.*, that we should openly declare ourselves his followers, regardless of the consequences, one of which is,

* 2 Peter ii. 2. † Matt. xxviii. 20.
‡ Luke vi. 46. § Acts viii. 23. ‖ John xvii. 20.
¶ 1 Cor. xi. 1. ** 1 Cor. ii. 16. †† 1 Peter ii. 21.

to be hated of all men for his sake.* "Why," asks the apostle, "are they then baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?"† In other words; If we have not the consoling assurance that we shall live again, and ever reign with Christ, why are we, at the risque of our present life, publicly baptized in his name?

It is certain that the apostles acted in accordance with the command of their divine Master; for he worked "with them, confirming the word with signs following."‡ That he did so, the "Acts of the Apostles" afford abundant proof. At the death of John, the testimony of Christ being fully established, revelation terminated; consequently, the written word is now our only guide,§ which none that are taught of the Spirit can mistake. And I think you yourself will allow, however much you may disclaim the authority, that, according to the gospel, the heaviest judgments are denounced against those who shall add to, or take from it."||

According to your argument, neither baptism nor abstinence from blood is binding on the christian. You think it strange that the apostles should enjoin abstinence from things strangled and from blood, no less imperatively than from fornication; presuming, as I suppose, that the infraction of the former would be a trifling sin compared with committing the latter; but both being forbidden, both must be alike sinful; for "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."¶ You cannot have forgotten, sir, that it was the eating of a forbidden thing that brought death and destruction into the world. In the texts before us, fornication, being the only work of the flesh prohibited, and standing in connexion with the pollution of idols, it may have the same meaning here as it has in 2 Chron. xxi. 11. 13.

Immediately after the old world had been destroyed, and the Lord had blessed Noah and his sons, he forbade their eating blood under the penalty of death; a penalty which, so far as I am aware, was never attached to literal fornication. How great, then, must be the sin of breaking that law, which was denounced even before that of murder;** that law, which was on record eight hundred years before the Mosaic dispensation, was in full force during its continuance,†† and remains in full force to the present day.‡‡ To

* Matt. x. 22. † 1 Cor. xv. 29, 30. ‡ Mark xvi. 20.
§ See Rom. vi. 17; and 2 Thess. i. 8; iii. 14.
|| Rev. xxii. 18, 19. ¶ James ii. 10. ** See Gen. ix. 4—6.
†† Lev. iii. 17; vii. 26, 27. ‡‡ Acts xv. 29.

abstain from blood, then, was made imperative from the day on which permission was given to man to eat of every moving thing that liveth;* and the same law, having never been revoked, is imperative still; and is as binding on believers now as it was on the first christians, as well as on mankind in general.

You allow that baptism was the type of conversion to christianity itself. And if it was so at the time of the apostles, there can be no valid objection why it should not be so now. We are no more born christians than are the Jews who dwell among us. It is our being baptized in faith that entitles us to the christian character, and to the privileges attached to it. Not the act of itself; that is only a public declaration of our faith, as signing our will before witnesses is a public declaration of our mind; and as, in the one case, if what we pretend to will be only imaginary, the signature is valueless, so likewise, in the other, the want of faith renders the baptism of an unbeliever valueless also.

Our Lord, at the time that he gave his apostles their commission, said, "Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high."† On the day of pentecost they were endued with that power, and were thus fully prepared to receive and preach his doctrine. And what was the sum of the first sermon they preached after being thus fully prepared? This! "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here baptism and the remission of sins are so inseparably connected, that the latter cannot be enjoyed while the former is slighted. And here we are shown, in few words, that the baptism of the Spirit is consequent on baptism in water. You affirm that the apostles had a ministry of their own; here you differ from Paul, who asserts, that by the Spirit of God they were made "able ministers of the New Testament."‡

You appear, sir, always to take it for granted, that the New Testament ordinances were ordinances and shadows of the law; and also to doubt whether the apostles really knew what it was to worship God in spirit and in truth. And yet, according to your "observations," they were not, while administering baptism on the principles of Judaism, acting in opposition to the will of their divine Master, who, in your opinion, "imposed upon them no sudden change of conduct respecting ritual observances, but simply left them in

* Gen. ix. 3, 4. † Luke xxiv. 49. ‡ 2 Cor. iii. 3—6.

possession of those great principles of spiritual religion, the tendency of which was to undermine all such observances at the very foundation, and thus in a gradual manner to effect their abolition." And gradual indeed it must have been, if the observances were not to be abolished until the year 1677, which, according to your book,* must be about the time that this new light burst upon the world. Now, sir, to whom was it revealed that the period had arrived for their abolition? Was it to the founder of your denomination, George Fox, with whom your "strange doctrines" originated? And, except yours, is there any other body of people, professing to acknowledge Christ to be the Son of God, which has for such a length of time decried all his ordinances?

"The sentiments of friends," you say,† "on the present subject, are confirmed by their own experience. That society has, for more than a century and a half, been acting, in reference to the ministry, on the principles which have now been stated; and they certainly have never found reason for considering those principles either untrue or inefficacious." But to what purpose, sir, is the above declaration? The Roman Catholics have been, for upwards of a dozen centuries, acting after the same manner; and yet, I think you will not subscribe to the doctrine that their principles are either true or efficacious.

It would appear that, instead of trying your peculiarities by the standard of the gospel, you would force the gospel to the standard of your peculiarities: and, fancying yourself inspired with the "great principles of religion," presume that you have a revelation beyond what the apostles had; a revelation which teaches you that their example is not "universally imperative on the ministers of christianity." "Woe unto the foolish prophets, that follow their own spirit, and have seen nothing."‡

"But," say you,§ "there is another reason why the example of the earliest christian teachers affords no valid evidence that the practice of water baptism is still incumbent on the ministers of the gospel of Christ, namely, that this example was not uniform. Its uniformity is known to have been interrupted by two exceptions, of peculiar weight and importance. The exception which I shall first notice is that of the apostle Paul. That eminent individual, who was not 'a whit behind the chiefest apostles,' and who had formerly been a 'pharisee of the pharisees,' and a zealot in support of the

* Page 153. † Ibid. 153. ‡ Ezek. xiii. 3. § Page 101—104.

Jewish law, when he was once converted to the christian faith, was the first to throw off the bondage of that law, and he presently excelled his brethren in his views of the spirituality of the gospel dispensation. Accordingly, we find that baptism with water was, in his judgment, by no means indispensable, or inseparably connected with the duties of a christian minister. However it may be admitted, as a probability, that his converts received baptism at the hands of other persons, it is certain that a great proportion of them were never baptized in water by the apostle himself. He expressly asserts that, among the whole multitude of the Corinthians who had been converted by his ministry, he baptized *none*, save Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas.* It is not, however, merely the apostle's personal abstinence from the use of the rite, which claims our attention in reference to the present argument; it is rather the ground and principle on which he declares that he abstained from it. The practice of this ceremony in the christian church is supported chiefly by the generally received opinion that Christ commanded his apostles, when they made disciples of all nations, to baptize them with water; and that, from the apostles, this duty has descended to all the rightly authorised ministers of christianity, who, like them, are engaged in the promulgation of christian truth. But Paul, highly favoured as he was, as a minister of the gospel, and engaged far more extensively than any of his brethren in the work of making disciples of all nations, abstained to a very great extent from the act of baptizing with water; and for this express reason, *that he had received no commission to perform it.* 'For Christ,' said he, 'sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.'†

"The other exception alluded to, is one of still greater moment. It is that of the Divine Founder of our religion himself. The holy Jesus, that first and most eminent of the preachers of the gospel, rendered in his own person complete obedience to all righteousness as it was observed under the law, and therefore he submitted to the baptism of John. But his own converts, who belonged to that spiritual institution which he so frequently denominates the 'kingdom of heaven,'‡ he *baptized not;* although he permitted his disciples to practise that ceremony, he abstained from it himself. This fact is noticed by the apostle John, who, after stating that 'the pharisees heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than

* 1 Cor. i. 14—16. † Verse 17. ‡ Matt. xi. 11, &c.

John,' carefully adds, (for the prevention of error, no doubt, on so interesting a subject,) 'though (or howbeit) *Jesus himself baptized not*, but his disciples.'* Those preachers of the gospel, therefore, who consider it their duty, in conformity with the great fundamental law of christian worship, to abstain from the practice of baptizing their converts in water, have the consolation to know, that in adopting such a line of conduct, they are following the example of Him who is on all hands allowed to have afforded us a *perfect* pattern.

"Since, therefore, water baptism was a Jewish ceremony, or typical observance; since, under the new dispensation, the plan of divine worship is changed, and all such observances are by a general law abolished; since, in precise conformity with that law, 'the doctrine of baptisms,' as unfolded in various passages of the New Testament, appears to attribute to christianity *only* the baptism of the Spirit; since that particular passage in which the outward rite is supposed to be enjoined upon christians, may with the truest critical propriety be otherwise explained; and since the example of the first preachers of christianity in favour of that ceremony arose out of peculiar circumstances, and was interrupted by two overpowering exceptions, I cannot but deem it undeniable that the Society of Friends are fully justified in their disuse of water baptism."

Sir, I cannot but regard the above paragraphs as most inconsistent; for in them you deny and affirm the same things. But why did you not quote what, according to your line of argument, is another interruption of the example; that of Peter not baptizing Cornelius and his friends. Was it because you were fearful of bringing that transaction to the light? It is quite as much to your purpose as the two others. From the instances of the apostle's deputing others to baptize, it appears manifest that it was a higher office to prepare the people for baptism, than to baptize them. Therefore, when it may be found requisite, any genuine disciple may administer the ordinance, without either derogating from the gospel, or in anywise favouring your argument. You must be well aware, sir, that "it is customary in all countries, and in all languages, to attribute the operations of those who are under the government and direction of another, to him by whom they are directed and governed." We have an exemplification of this in Exodus xxxii. 35, adapted to the most obtuse understanding. "The Lord plagued the people, because they made the calf, which *Aaron* made." You would not

* John iv. 1, 2.

affirm that the omnipotent power of God was interrupted, because, when the people murmured for water, the Most High did not smite the rock himself, but sent Moses to smite it;* and this is a parallel case.

Again, sir, if you are correct in saying "that eminent individual (Paul), who had formerly been 'a pharisee of the pharisees,' and a zealot in support of the Jewish law, was the first to throw off the bondage of that law;" and if, as by your own showing, baptism was a part of that law, would he not have thrown that off also, and not retained it as an exception to a general rule?

But, sir, let us turn to his conversion; let us notice the manner of it, and then observe how he himself proceeded, after he had been converted. A light "shined round about him...a light from heaven; he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying to him...I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest....And he, trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do....And Ananias,... putting his hands on him, said, Brother Saul, the Lord... hath sent me that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost; and immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales; and he received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized."† This he did at the command of Ananias, who said to him, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."‡ Here again we have the connexion between baptism in water and the remission of sins. Paul's natural blindness was emblematical of the dark state of his mind; and his receiving sight emblematical of its being enlightened by the Spirit of God. The command and promise given by Peter on the day of Pentecost was, "Repent, and be baptized... in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Now as Paul had received the gift, we might, after the manner of men, naturally ask, Where was the utility of his conforming to an ordinance, the gift of which, in other instances, was consequent on that ordinance? Our answer to such a question would be, that obedience to a positive precept, commanded by Christ, is required, and especially to a precept of so much importance that he did not permit even the baptism of the Spirit to supersede it; because it was instituted of his Father as an ordinance by which to testify repentance for the remission of sins, and by which confession

* Exod. xvii. 6. † See Acts ix. ‡ Acts xxii. 16.

of them was to be made.* The baptism of the apostle was the seal put to his faith, that the atonement made for him by the Saviour of the world had for ever cleansed him from all his sins, and that they should be "remembered no more."† And may not this confession and remission of sins, in the ordinance of baptism, be the antitype to Aaron confessing over the live goat the sins of the children of Israel, putting them upon his head, that he should bear upon him all their iniquities, into a land not inhabited?‡ No man who understands the gospel can scripturally expect to enter the kingdom of heaven but by the means that God has appointed.

With respect to your assertion, that Paul "had received no commission to baptize," you have asserted more than you can prove. Paul says of himself, that he was "called to be an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God."§ And to the Galatians he says, "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."‖ Now as Paul baptized after the manner of the apostle Peter, does it not appear manifest, that when he was caught up into paradise, and there saw his Lord,¶ that he received at his mouth the same commission to baptize as the other apostles had previously received?

We do not, I think, read of any converts through the preaching of Paul, before he came to Antioch, in Pisidia, where he made a number, who were filled with the Holy Ghost.** Afterwards, we find him at Iconium, with Barnabas, who both "so spake that a great multitude both of the Jews and also of the Greeks believed."†† Then, again, of his preaching the gospel at Derbe, and teaching many.‡‡ Next we find him and Silas at Philippi, where Lydia, the jailer, and their families were baptized; it matters not whether Paul or Silas administered the ordinance; both were consenting parties to it. We read of him next at Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews, in which Paul preached Christ, "and some of them believed, and consorted with Paul and Silas, and of the devout Greeks a great multitude;" next at Berea, where they found the Jews "more noble than those at Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind....Therefore many of them believed, also of honourable women which were Greeks, and of men, not a few;" then

* Mark i. 4, 5. † Heb. x. 17. ‡ Lev. xvi. 21, 22. § Rom. i. 1.
‖ Gal. i. 11, 12. ¶ 1 Cor. ix. 1. ** Acts xiii. 48. 52.
†† Acts xiv. 1. ‡‡ Acts xiv. 21.

at Athens, where certain men also "clave unto him, and believed."* Next at Corinth, where Crispus "believed on the Lord with all his house, and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized."† Next at Ephesus, where he found certain disciples who had been baptized, but had not known Christ, nor "heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." These, after they believed the preaching of Paul, were baptized.‡ Now if it cannot be clearly ascertained whether Paul baptized the latter, it is distinctly stated that he laid his hands upon them; and as we have no account of the laying on of hands previous to baptism, except in the instance of Paul himself, it is clear that if he did not baptize them, he acknowledged the act, and that the Holy Ghost sanctioned it.

Between the time of Paul's conversion, and that of his having converted and baptized the twelve at Ephesus, there is no specific account given of the baptism of all his converts; but where it is not given, it is most assuredly implied: at Antioch, in Pisidia, the converts were said to be filled with the Holy Ghost; at Derbe, that they were taught; at Philippi, that they were baptized; at Iconium and Berea, that they believed; at Thessalonica, that they believed and consorted with Paul and Silas; at Athens, that they believed and clave to Paul; at Corinth, that they believed and were baptized. And we cannot doubt that both Paul and Silas acted, in every one of these instances, according to the commission of their great Master; that all their converts believed, and were baptized in water, and afterwards by the Spirit, and then spake with tongues, as is related of those at Ephesus, and which accords with the promise of the Saviour of man, Mark xvi. 17. It would indeed "be derogatory to the Spirit of God to attempt to harmonize these passages by expunging baptism from those in which it is mentioned." We have no account even of Paul receiving the gift of tongues, yet we know that he did receive it, for he said to the Corinthians, "I speak with tongues more than you all." And it would also "be unprecedented in the annals of the world, if the historian were always to record all the circumstances of the same institution, on every allusion to it, and it would have been equally so for the apostles always to have mentioned it in the same words." Why, then, should Paul have mentioned all the minute particulars respecting conversions—particulars so well known to his immediate followers, and so minutely revealed to us that none but the wilfully blind can reject them?

* Acts xvii. 1—4. 11, 12. 34. † Acts xviii. 8. ‡ Acts xix. 1—7.

Now, sir, I think the preceding narratives clearly show, that when Paul said, Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel, he could mean nothing more than that he was sent to preach the gospel, rather than to baptize; for before he made the assertion, he said that he had baptized Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas. And it is particularly stated that all the Corinthians that believed were baptized; consequently, the baptism was equally valid, whether administered by Paul himself, or by his command; while it is further particularly stated, that the Lord sanctioned and encouraged Paul in all that he did at Corinth, by speaking to him in a vision thus; "Be not afraid, but speak, and hold not thy peace; for I am with thee, and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee; for I have much people in this city."*

These things, then, sir, contradict your assertion, that "baptism in water was in Paul's judgment by no means indispensable, or inseparably connected with the duties of a christian minister;" while your timid manner of expression, using the word *probability*, obviously indicates that you either believe in your heart that all his converts were baptized in water, or, if you believe otherwise, that you have not the courage directly to avow it; and thus place yourself in a situation similar to that of the priests and elders, as recorded Matt. xxi. 23—27. Were you assured that your "peculiarities" are founded on a rock, then, instead of *deeming* "it undeniable that the Society of Friends are fully justified in the disuse of water baptism," you would boldly assert that no one can, according to the gospel, be justified in the use of it, seeing that, in your opinion, there is but one baptism, that of the Spirit. On the contrary, you make it manifest, by framing so many excuses for the disuse of it, that you have misgivings on the subject. The only ground which Paul could have had for not baptizing, was doubtless that of having to fulfil a more important office. It was not possible for the apostles to baptize all those whom they were the means of converting; witness the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, and the five thousand mentioned Acts iv. 4. At present, genuine conversions are so rare, that the ministers of the gospel need no assistance; but when "a little one shall become a thousand, and a small one a strong nation,"† both ministers and "helpers" shall be so increased as to fill the whole earth, and to convert the whole of its inhabitants.‡

* Acts xviii. 8—10. † Isa. lx. 22. ‡ See Hab. ii. 14. Rev. xiv. 1—7.

"The practice of the ceremony (baptism) in the christian church, is supported," you have said, "chiefly by the generally received opinion that Christ commanded his apostles, when they made disciples of all nations, to baptize them with water." Why, sir, you yourself encourage this opinion by saying, "It would at once be uncandid and useless to deny that the participle 'baptizing,' as it is used Matt. xxviii. 19, is capable, on common philological principles, of being interpreted in its literal sense, as relating to an outward immersion;" and further, that the ministers "who continue the practice are no proper subjects of blame." And yet you assert that the commission may with the truest critical propriety be otherwise explained. If, then, the uninitiated, for whose instruction your "Observations" were written, are not to be guided by the literal meaning of it, how, may I inquire, are they to be guided, while you keep them in ignorance of its other explanation?

Paul, the inspired apostle of the Gentiles, was a bold and straightforward character; his words and actions were consistent. He would not have baptized one portion of the Corinthian converts, and said to the other portion, "I have no commission to baptize;" and you, sir, can have no authority to say it for him. He was not the man to allow another to perform an act from which he himself shrunk, and he could not have preached the gospel according to the commission, if he had not preached baptism. That he did preach it is manifest, from the following quotation from his Epistle to the Galatians; "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."* And it was to these Galatians he said, "If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."†

You flatter yourself that our Lord's not baptizing in person gives greater support to your peculiarities, than that of Paul's not baptizing; but they are parallel cases. It is evident that the evangelist John knew no difference between our Lord himself baptizing, and his baptizing through the instrumentality of his disciples; for in the chapter preceding that from which you quote, he distinctly states that our Lord did baptize.‡

The baptism of the Son of God by John, cannot be regarded as an act of obedience to the Mosaic law, because baptism, as I have before shown, was no part of that law. Besides, "our Lord sprang out of Judah, of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood."§ But as Moses was commanded to wash Aaron and his sons, before

* Gal. iii. 27. † Gal. i. 9. ‡ John iii. 22. 26. § Heb. vii. 14.

all the congregation, at the door of the tabernacle, and to consecrate them for the priests' office.* So our Lord, when he began to be about thirty years old,† the age at which, under the old dispensation, the Levites "came to do the service of the ministry,"‡ he required John to baptize him, and that before all the people,§ in order that he might be hallowed to minister in the priests' office under the new dispensation, that of his own gospel.

For "the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also in the law;"‖ and the beginning of a more excellent ministry demanded for induction into the enjoyment of its privileges a more excellent and impressive ordinance, and one more expressive of its design, than did that of the ministry of Aaron.

After our Lord had been baptized, he was not anointed with oil, as Aaron was after he had been washed by Moses; but he was anointed with the Holy Spirit of God; in other words, he was baptized with it. And you may with as much propriety assert, that this anointing or baptism appertained to the old dispensation, as to assert that baptism in water did.

To pervert the scriptures at the present day, and to prevent the people from congregating to study them, is to do worse than Omri did, and he did worse than Jeroboam, who made Israel to sin;¶ because it is sinning against greater light—the light of the gospel. And it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah, in the day of judgment, than for such as will not hear the words of the apostles;** because they manifest a more determined enmity against God, than was manifested by all the execrable acts committed in those two cities; and therefore it was that the apostles were commanded to "shake off the dust of their feet," as a testimony against them; which command, in the instance of the Jews at Antioch, they obeyed.†† Permit me, then, sir, as a friend, to beseech you to follow the advice which Paul gives to Simon,‡‡ that, while it is called to-day, you may be led to see, and confess your errors, to believe in Christ, and to profess your faith by that ordinance which he has made binding on every one who shall look for salvation through him.

You constantly take it for granted, sir, that baptism in water was a Jewish ceremony; that on this account it was abolished, along with

* Lev. viii. 1—9. † Luke iii. 23. ‡ Num. iv. 47.
§ Matt. iii. Luke iii. 21 ‖ Heb. vii. 12. ¶ 1 Kings xvi. 25, 26.
** Mark vi. 11. †† See Matt. x. 14; Acts xiii. 51. ‡‡ Acts viii. 22.

the dispensation with which it was connected; and that therefore the doctrine of baptisms, as unfolded in the New Testament, attributes to christianity the baptism of the Spirit *only*. This is a very easy, although a very vague, method of establishing your peculiarities. But you are bound to show, by clear scriptural authority,—traditions, assumptions, and probabilities will not suffice,—why Peter, who was influenced by the Holy Spirit, commanded Cornelius and his friends to be baptized with water, after he had ocular demonstration that they were baptized with the Holy Ghost. This circumstance you have not ventured to bring forward, and have thus shown yourself wise in your generation,* for it puts to shame all your specious sophistry. Peter's conduct in this transaction affords satisfactory evidence that he understood the participle "baptizing," as it occurs in the commission, in the plain, simple, literal sense of the term, and not in the metaphorical sense in which you would have it to be understood. "I have heard what the prophets said, that prophesy lies in my name ... yea, they are prophets of the deceit of their own heart, which think to cause my people to forget my name by their dreams.... He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord."†

In concluding this matter, I shall bring together the passages of scripture in which baptism is most particularly mentioned, and make a few observations as I proceed.

"The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God.... John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out to him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins."‡ "There was a man sent from God whose name was John.... And they (the Pharisees) asked him... Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet? John answered them saying, I baptize with water, but there standeth one among you whom ye know not; he it is, who, coming after me, is preferred before me.... And I knew him not; but that he should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I knew him not; but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending and remaining on him, the

* Luke xvi. 8. † Jer. xxiii. 25—28. ‡ Mark i. 1. 4, 5.

same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."* In these passages we read, for the first time, of the institution of baptism; of the authority by which it was instituted—God the Father; and of the design of the institution—to manifest the Son of God. From several circumstances noted in them, and from what is said, Acts xiii. 24, "When John had *first* preached, before his (Christ's) coming, the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel," there can be no question whether baptism had ever before been administered as an initiatory ordinance. John, from being the first who baptized, was called THE BAPTIST. If the ordinance had not been new to the Jews, they would certainly not have called him by that emphatic name, nor have asked him why he baptized. John was of the priesthood; and if, as you argue, baptism was an ancient Jewish ordinance, it is difficult to conceive why the sacred historians were so particular in giving their account of it.

That it was the beginning of a new dispensation, ushered in by a new institution, which is to continue till time shall end,† and that it was of heavenly original, is clear, from the question put by our Lord "to the chief priests and scribes; "The baptism of John, was it from heaven, or of men?" If it had been a rite practised by the Jews of old, they might, without reasoning, have answered at once, that it was of men. But they were in a dilemma: they knew that if they spoke the truth, a rebuke awaited them, and if a falsehood, that they should be stoned by the people;‡ they therefore chose rather to utter a falsehood, than to say it was from heaven.

Our Lord's coming to John to be baptized, is particularly recorded; "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him; but John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.... And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him: and, lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."§ Surely this record is sufficient of itself to define the nature of baptism, and to show the distinction between that which is literal and that which is metaphorical. Our Saviour was circumcised, and presented to the

* John i. 6, 25—27, 31—33. † See Matt. xxviii. 20. ‡ Luke xx. 3—7.
§ Matt. iii. 13—17.

Lord,* in conformity to the old dispensation, then about to cease; and he was baptized, in conformity to the new, which had then recently begun.

Our Lord's entering on his ministry is next recorded; and the record shows that he baptized those who received his testimony, after the pattern that he himself had set them. "Jesus and his disciples came into the land of Judea; and there he tarried with them, and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Ænon,...because there was much water there; and they came, and were baptized.... And they (the Jews) came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan...behold the same baptizeth, and all men come to him."† Therefore, said John, "This my joy is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease." This we see verified, by the first verse of the next chapter; "When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,) he left Judea." The words included in the parenthesis can never, on just principles, be admitted as an argument against the observance of the ordinance; for to administer the ordinance through the instrumentality of his disciples, was virtually to administer it himself.

We next come to the commission which our Lord gave to his disciples, immediately before he ascended to heaven. This important commission is expressed in terms at once clear, simple, positive, and illustrative of what he had previously taught; it contains all requisite directions, not only for their ministry, but for that of all their legitimate successors; so that it would seem impossible, except wilfully, to mistake it.‡ And this commission cannot be annulled or superseded till "he shall come the second time without sin unto salvation."§ These are the terms of it; "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world. Amen."‖ "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned."¶ "Then opened he their understanding,... and said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoveth Christ to suffer,... and that repentance

* Luke ii. 21, 22. † John iii. 22. 26. ‡ See Isa. xxxv. 8.
§ Heb. ix. 28. ‖ Matt. xxviii. 19—20. ¶ Mark xvi. 15, 16.

and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations."* "And being assembled together with them, (he) commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which, saith he, ye have heard of me. For John *truly* baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence....Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you; and ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight."†

Here, then, we have John's baptism denominated true water baptism, and being by the Lord connected with the baptism of the Spirit, it is clearly intimated that the apostles had either been baptized by John, or by some of the disciples; and that in consequence of the faith and repentance which they had manifested by their baptism in water, after the pattern of their Lord, they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost. Thus the disciple would "be as his Master, and the servant as his Lord."‡ And yet, sir, these are the men whose example, according to your teaching, believers are not required to follow.§

I shall next prove that our Lord did not, and could not, design that baptism should be understood of the Spirit only; and this I shall do by showing the way in which the apostles, acting under the commission, proceeded. "Now when they (the multitude) heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter,... What shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized, every one of you,... and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost....Then they that gladly received his word were baptized."‖ "When they (the Samaritans) believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.... Then laid they (Peter and John) their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost."¶ "Philip preached unto him (the eunuch) Jesus. And... they came unto a certain water, and the eunuch said, See, here is water! what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he

* Luke xxiv. 45—47.
† Acts i. 4, 5. 8, 9.
‡ Matt. x. 25; see also Rom. viii. 29.
§ See 1 Cor. xi. 1.
‖ Acts ii. 37, 38. 41.
¶ Acts viii. 12—17.

answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.... And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him."*

We have then an account of Paul's baptism, who was, as before mentioned, baptized in water, after being baptized with the Holy Ghost. Next, that of Cornelius and his friends, who likewise were baptized, first with the baptism of the Spirit, and then with the baptism of water. Then, the baptism of Lydia, and of the jailer, and their households. Then of the transaction at Ephesus, as related in Acts xix. 1—6, when Paul, faithful to his commission, baptized about twelve, and, *after he had laid his hands on them*, the administration was approved of God, by their being baptized with the Holy Ghost. It is evident, therefore, that they had then been baptized in faith, and that that which they had previously supposed to be baptism, was in Paul's judgment not baptism. The latter passage of itself establishes the vast importance of the ordinance; and, what is of still further importance, it is to be administered to believers only. So that "no man, speaking by the Spirit of God," can say that baptism in water is not in accordance with the commission; nor, when scripturally considered, that it "leads to superstition."

I shall now, sir, bring under your notice a few passages from the Epistles, in which the subject of baptism is mentioned. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life....For he that is dead is freed (or justified) from sin."† "Buried with him in baptism; wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead."‡ "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?§ "The like figure, whereunto even baptism, doth also now save us... by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."‖ With no show of reason, without even the shadow of *probability*, can it be asserted that the baptism alluded to in these passages is the baptism of the Spirit. Was it by the baptism of the Spirit that the first disciples were, or that we are, buried with Christ,? Were they subjected to persecution and death, in consequence of their being baptized with

* Acts viii. 35—38. † Rom. vi. 3, 4. 7. ‡ Col. ii. 12.
§ 1 Cor xv. 29. ‖ 1 Peter iii. 21.

the Spirit? No! it was the outward and visible baptism,—that baptism which is now so generally "spoken against,"—which brought the wrath of the world upon them. Is the baptism of the Spirit a figure by which we are saved? No, the baptism of the Spirit is a reality, a substance; not a transient impression, but an abiding baptism, by which, after we have been baptized in water, we gradually arrive at the full knowledge of the word, and "grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ."* As it is written, "When he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth,...and he will show you things to come."† Not that the Spirit is received now in a visible manner, attended with miraculous gifts and powers, such as were imparted to the apostles, and to the disciples contemporary with them. The object for which such gifts and powers were imparted,—the establishment of the doctrine of Christ,—having been accomplished,—they are no longer necessary, and have therefore, since the Revelator's death, been discontinued. Nevertheless, the baptism of the Spirit is still attended with such power as to give the recipients of it a mouth and wisdom, which all their "adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist."‡

In every passage where the baptism of the Spirit is spoken of, the terms employed are so plain and express, that it cannot in any instance be mistaken for the baptism of water; and the same may be said of the latter. One is placed as antecedent to, and one as consequent on, the other. As I baptize with water, but he shall baptize with the Holy Ghost.§ "John truly baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."‖ "Repent and be baptized...and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;"¶ "for as yet he was fallen upon none of them, only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost."** "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied."†† Is it possible, sir, for any one reading these passages with a simple and unprejudiced mind to put any other construction on them, or to come to any other conclusion than that baptism in water and the baptism of the Spirit are

* Eph. iv. 15. † John xvi. 13. ‡ Luke xxi. 15.
§ Matt. iii. 11. ‖ Acts i. 5. ¶ Acts ii. 38.
** Acts viii. 16, 17. †† Acts xix. 5, 6.

distinct and separate things; that the latter has not superseded the former, but that both are as essential to the salvation of man now as they were in the days of the apostles.

We see then, that our Lord gave his apostles a commission to preach the gospel to every creature, and to baptize all who received their testimony; that he gave a general promise, that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" that the first time the commission was acted upon, Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized *every one of you*, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost;" that certain individuals in Samaria, after they had been baptized in water, received the Holy Ghost; and that Paul said, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, (the first available confession being by baptism in water,) and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."* "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him;" not buried and risen with him by faith, because faith is invisible till it is manifested by baptism; and because to make the figure perfect baptism is insufficient, unless accompanied by faith. No one then may expect to be baptized with the Spirit until he has been baptized with water; nor expect to enter the kingdom of heaven previously to his being "born of water and the Spirit." In short, no one who neglects or rejects the ordinances of Christ should flatter himself that he is one of many that "are one body in Christ;"† nor expect to be saved through him who says, "No man cometh to the Father but by me;"‡ nor suppose himself included among those of whom it is said, "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."§ He ought rather to attend to the following exhortation: "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven."‖

* Rom. x. 9, 10. † Rom. xii. 5. ‡ John xiv. 6.
§ Rev. xxii. 14. ‖ Heb. xii. 25.

You next* "proceed to the consideration of those parts of the New Testament which relate to the institution denominated the LORD'S SUPPER," and say,

"In order to clear our ground respecting the nature and character of that ordinance, it will be desirable, in the first place, to direct our attention to the tenth chapter of the First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians; a chapter which contains a remarkable allusion to the Lord's supper, as it was observed by the early christians....On a comparison with certain parts of the following chapter, (hereafter to be noticed,) it must in all fairness be allowed, that the bread broken and the cup of blessing, which the apostle here describes as a 'joint participation in the body and blood of Christ,' are the bread and the cup of wine which were eaten and drunk in a literal sense at the supper, denominated by the apostle himself the Lord's Supper (chap. xi. 20.) It appears, then, that those who ate and drank together of that cup and wine were joint participants in the body and blood of Christ, on the same principle, and in the same sense, that the Jews who ate together of the sacrifices ordained by the law were joint participants in the altar, and the christians who united with idolaters in the eating of meats offered to false gods were joint participants in *devils*. As no one imagines that these mixed companies of idolaters and christians united in eating *the devils*, or that the Jewish worshippers united in eating *the altar;* so it is altogether an error to suppose that the christian communicants are here represented by the apostles as feeding on the *body and blood of Christ*. When we compare the three cases together, the whole that we can gather from the apostle's description of the bread and wine is this, that as the eaters of meats sacrificed to the idols were joint participants in those things which respected the service of devils, and as the Jews who ate the victims sacrificed under the law were joint participants in those things which respected the altar, so the christians, when they met to celebrate the Lord's supper, were joint participants in those things which respected the body and blood, or the sacrifice, of Jesus Christ.

"I have entered into this examination of the passage before us, not so much for the purpose of disproving the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, as in order to show that the apostle's

* Pages 104—106.

words give no real countenance to the notion, so generally entertained among Protestants, that those who communicate in the rite of the Lord's supper, *do thereby feed together, in a spiritual sense, on the body and blood of Christ....*

"In these days of increasing light and spirituality, as we may justly esteem them, it is necessary to say but very little on this branch of our subject. Although the communicants in the rite of the Lord's supper may sometimes be permitted to 'eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man,' no arguments need now be advanced to prove that this spiritual eating and drinking has no necessary connexion with any external ceremony; and that in every time and place it may be the privilege of the humble christian, who lives by faith in the Son of God, and whose soul is subjected to the purifying yet sustaining influence of his Holy Spirit. (See John vi. 53. 63.) Neither will it be any longer disputed, that when persons of such a character meet in companies for the solemn purpose of worshipping the Father, they may, without any use of the outward ordinance, *feed together, in a spiritual sense, on the body and blood of Christ*, and experience the truest communion with their Holy Head, and one with another, *in him*. (See Matt. xviii. 20.)"

When you argued, sir, in favour of the "*disuse*" (to use your own term,) of baptism, you admitted that, on common philological principles, the participle baptizing might be interpreted in its literal sense; but that an impartial view of the various collateral points would lead to a very different construction of the meaning. But here, before you commence your argument for the "disuse" of the supper, you admit without reserve that the supper which the apostles describe was a literal eating of the bread and drinking of the wine. Now, sir, since the time of the apostles' ministry there has been no increase of light beyond what was then enjoyed. We may, indeed, have stronger eyes, and can behold the light more steadily, than the body of the people then could, because we have the united instructions of all the apostles shining upon us, which they as individuals had not, the gospel not being then published. More, therefore, is expected from us, and we are less excusable if we do not attend with more circumspection to what the apostles taught, and to what they and their converts practised.

You say that this spiritual eating and drinking has no necessary connexion with any external ceremony, and according to your quotation from John vi. 53. 63, this may be true. But then none can

scripturally feed upon Christ after that manner, who refuses to follow the example of the apostles, and to eat and drink literally at his table. After the commission was proclaimed, we have no proof that any one contemporary with the apostles lived by the faith of the Son of God, previously to his being baptized in water; nor of any that did not ever afterwards keep him in remembrance, by habitually partaking of the bread and wine as a typical representation of his flesh and blood. The eunuch even may be no exception, for it is at once natural and scriptural to presume that he was made an instrument of establishing churches in Ethiopia, and that he not only partook of, but administered, the ordinance. We have also ground to conclude that, like other converts, he was a partaker of the general promise,* the gift of the Spirit, which would teach him "all things,"† and finish the work which had been begun in him.‡

"We may proceed," you say,§ "to examine those passages of the New Testament which have given rise to the opinion so generally entertained by modern theologians, that such a rite was ordained by our Saviour, and that the practice of it is universally obligatory on believers in Christ. The passages to which I have to refer under this head are only two in number. The first is in the Gospel of Luke, who, in describing the last paschal supper which Jesus ate with his disciples, shortly before his crucifixion, writes as follows: 'And he (Jesus) took bread and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you; *this do in remembrance of me.* Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.'‖

"The second passage alluded to contains a declaration of the apostle Paul's, which fully confirms the particulars related by Luke. It appears that the Corinthian converts had so greatly abused the practice to which the injunction of Christ had given rise, that when they met together for the purpose of eating the Lord's supper in company, there was found among them a total want of order and harmony, and many of them availed themselves of the opportunity thus afforded them, for the intemperate indulgence of their carnal appetites. 'For in eating,' says the apostle, every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken.' In order to correct habits of so disgraceful a character, Paul sharply

* Acts ii. 38. † John xiv. 26. ‡ Phil. i. 6. § Page 108.
‖ Luke xxii. 19, 20.

reproves these Corinthians, and calls to their recollection the origin and object of the observance. 'For I have received of the Lord,' says he, 'that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take eat, this is my body which is broken for you; *this do in remembrance of me.* After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often,' adds the apostle, 'as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.'*

"It will be observed, that in this address to the Corinthians, the apostle is not *enjoining* upon them the practice of celebrating the Lord's supper. The passage contains no *command* of the apostle's to that effect: it was intended solely to warn them against their abuse of that practice, and to explain to them its origin and true purpose. Accordingly, he briefly recites the circumstances which had given rise to it. The knowledge of these circumstances, it appears, he had 'received of the Lord;' and the apostle's statement, founded on the instruction thus given to him on the subject, substantially accords with the narrative of Luke. We are therefore to consider it as a fact resting on *confirmed* evidence, that when our Lord, at his last paschal supper, invited the disciples to take and eat the bread which he had broken, he added, '*This do in remembrance of me.*' And further, we learn from the apostle, that after Jesus had handed to them the cup to drink, he repeated a similar command, *This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*'"

The passage in Luke gives our Lord's command for the express observation of the ordinance, which was instituted to keep his love in mind,—"this do in remembrance of me." The passage in the Corinthians is a confirmation of the command, and explains more extensively the nature and design of it; "as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." Now as those to whom Paul wrote could in their day only do this, it

* 1 Cor. xi. 23—29.

is manifest that this institution was intended to be observed by every successive generation of believers, until Christ "shall appear the second time."

Paul was recapitulating the instructions which he had previously communicated to them, for he says, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." If he had not before explained to them the object of the supper, and the manner of its celebration, he could not with propriety have reproved them for the abuse of it. In verses 28. 33, 34, which you do not quote, he says, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup....Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another. And if any man hunger, let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation." Here the apostle exhorts them to a reverential and orderly observance of the ordinance, and calls their attention to what he had formerly enjoined; and his exhortation and enjoinment is still applicable to the people of the present day, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments."*

In a note, you say,† "This apostle *had learned*, or *had been taught* of the Lord, the several particulars respecting the last supper, which he afterwards communicated to his Corinthian converts; but in *what manner* he received the information in question, the text does not specify. It might be by that merely spiritual illumination which he enjoyed in so large a measure. It might also be through the medium of his inspired brethren, or through that of some written document which rested on divine authority. Whatever, indeed, this apostle knew in connexion with christian truth, and in whatever manner his knowledge of it was acquired, he might without impropriety describe himself as having learned it all *of the Lord*, who had interposed in so striking a manner for his convincement and conversion. Now, that the information given to him respecting the circumstances of the Lord's supper was received *mediately*, and not by any direct or extraordinary revelation, appears most probable, because those circumstances were simply historical, and were perfectly known to Paul's eleven brethren in the apostleship, who were present on the occasion, and who would, as a matter of course, communicate with him on a subject in which he was equally interested with themselves."

When you were endeavouring sir, to shew that the ordinance of

* Matt. xix. 17. † Page 111.

baptism was never intended to be observed by all the successive followers of our Lord, you *imagined* that one sentence out of Paul's Epistle to the Corinthian church* was sufficient to prove it. Then, you denominated him an eminent individual, not a whit behind the chiefest apostles. But now, when you are endeavouring to show the same of the supper also, you insinuate,—by instituting an enquiry how he became acquainted with the particulars respecting it,—that his authority at best was only second hand, that he received his information *mediately*. Now, sir, allow me to ask, Did you insinuate these things from design, or from ignorance of what Paul wrote to the Corinthians, and also to the Galatians, to whom he says, "I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man, for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ"?† It is by Paul's own account, that we know he was a preacher of the gospel, and it scripturally follows that he was an establisher of churches, during three years previously to his seeing any one of the apostles.‡ Consequently, he received all his knowledge of the gospel *immediately* from heaven.§ This indeed is implied by yourself, when you say, "of the operations of divine grace under this new covenant, none of the inspired writers appear to have enjoyed a clearer view than the apostle Paul."‖ Nay you have just before asserted that "the knowledge of these circumstances, it appears, he had received of the Lord."

"Persons," you say,¶ "who have long been habituated to consider these expressions of our Lord, 'this do in remembrance of me,' 'this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me,' in immediate connexion with the rite of the Eucharist *as they themselves observe it*, are very naturally led to explain the former by the latter; and thus with respect to the passages now quoted, they lose sight of those plain and simple principles of interpretation, which they would of course apply to any other part of the sacred volume. I confess I see no other way of accounting for the sentiment, still so prevalent among christians, that when our Lord, after participating with his disciples in their last paschal meal, said to them, 'do this in remembrance of me,' he instituted a religious ceremony which was thenceforward to form an essential part of worship, and which, in that point of view, was to be obligatory in all ages on the believers of Jesus. That the words of Christ, when tried by the test of

* 1 Cor. i. 17. † 1 Cor. xv. 1, 3; Gal. i. 1, 11, 12. ‡ Gal. i. 15—19.
§ See 2 Cor. xii. 4. ‖ Page 39. ¶ Page 112.

common rules, and explained by the circumstances under which they were spoken, *do not appear, and cannot be proved, to have been fraught with so extensive a meaning*, will probably be allowed by the candid and considerate critic, and I would suggest that no such meaning can justly be applied to them, for two reasons —

"That our Lord's words, in the first place, are not rightly interpreted, as fixing the institution of a *typical ceremony in connexion with christian worship*, there arises a strong presumption, on this general ground; that such an interpretation (a completely adventitious one, as far as relates to these mere words), is directly at variance with the acknowledged principle, that the old Jewish system of typical and ceremonial observances, was to be abrogated by the death of Christ, and with our Saviour's own law, that the Father was now to be worshiped, not according to the shadowy ritual of the Jews and Samaritans, but in spirit and in truth.

"Secondly, it is to be observed that the command of Jesus respecting the bread and wine was addressed only to twelve persons, and was of a nature simply *positive*. It is true that all the precepts of Jesus were addressed to those persons who were in his company at the time when they were uttered, and many of them probably to his apostles only; but there is an all sufficient reason why the bulk of them are to be received as of universal obligation, namely, that they are *moral* in their nature, and appertain to that unchangeable law of God, which, when revealed, demands the obedience of all men at all times. But a merely positive precept has no connexion with that unchangeable law, and does nothing more than enjoin, for some specific purpose, a practice *in itself* indifferent. Such a precept, therefore, appears to contain no sufficient *internal* evidence of its being binding on any persons except those to whom it was actually addressed, and others who were placed under the same particular circumstances. I would submit that an universal obligation on the followers of any *moral* law-giver to obey a precept of the nature now described, cannot be rightly admitted, unless it be by such law-giver expressly declared: and that its not being expressly declared, affords an indication that no such universality was intended."

It is evident, sir, that it is your intent to subvert the gospel; and that from your doubtful and pusillanimous manner of expressing yourself, you feel your peculiarities require weightier support than you are able to produce. Otherwise you would, like Paul,* have

* Acts xix. 8.

put on a bolder front, and not have appealed to the considerate critic, who "*probably*" might allow what you yourself have not the courage directly to assert. Neither would you have said there arises "*a strong presumption;*" nor that many of the precepts of Jesus were addressed "*probably*" to his apostles only; nor would you "*submit,*" &c.; nor say that not being expressly declared, affords "*an indication*" that no such universality was intended. Recollect, sir, your own avowal, "The English version of the Bible may be understood with sufficient precision without the aid of the critic." Whence, then, your appeal to the critic, and not to the Bible itself?

The "teaching" and acts of our Lord and his apostles was to show to "all flesh" the salvation of God;* and the miraculous acts of the latter were performed to prove that they were the characters ordained of Christ for the conversion of the world.† But their epistles were addressed to those that had already been converted, to those that had already been baptized into Christ, to teach them to observe all things whatsoever Christ has commanded,‡ and also "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.§ Paul, writing to the Corinthians, says, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you;" a positive proof that he understood the Lord's words to mean that the literal eating of the bread and drinking of the wine should be regarded as a New Testament ordinance, the celebration of which was to be enjoined on all the followers of Christ. Partaking of the supper followed close after the administration of baptism, as we read, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls. and they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking of bread*, and in prayers."‖ It was owing to the disorderly conduct of the Corinthian church that Paul saw it needful to explain a second time the nature of the institution.

Our Lord said, "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves." Which might imply, This is the last time you will have to celebrate this feast; therefore leave none of it. "For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the

* Luke iii. 6. † Mark xvi. 15—20. ‡ Matt. xxviii. 20.
§ Eph. iv. 12. ‖ Acts ii. 41, 42.

kingdom of God shall come:* *i. e.*, until after my resurrection, when the figure shall be merged in the substance. Here our Lord terminated the passover, and commenced the supper.

Matthew says, "as they were eating;" Mark, "as they did eat" (the lamb); Luke says, "he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, (Matthew and Mark say, "Take, eat,") "This is my body, which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after supper," *i. e.*, after they had eaten the bread, "saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you." (Matthew and Mark say, "which is shed for many;" and the former adds, "for the remission of sins.") Matthew says, "Drink ye all of it;" Mark, "they all drank of it." Thus the supper of the Lord was once celebrated, in the anticipation of deliverance from all the effects of sin; as the passover once was, in anticipation of the deliverance from Egyptian bondage.

That the lamb could not thenceforth be scripturally eaten is clear, because the blood of its antitype, the sprinkling of which was to preserve all nations from the destroying angel, was about to be shed; consequently, all legal ceremonies that had prefigured this great event must, as a natural consequence, from the time of its shedding, for ever cease. But, sir, be pleased to observe, that immediately after our Lord had, for the last time, celebrated the Jewish rite—the passover, and before he rose up from it, he virtually repealed it, by instituting the christian ordinance,—the supper, by which he commanded his apostles, and, through them, all their successive followers, to commemorate the love which he bore them. To obey this command has been, is now, and shall be to the end of time, the delight of every believer.†

I see not what else the apostles could understand the Lord's meaning to be, when he said, "Eat this bread, and drink this wine, in remembrance of me," but that they were to commemorate his death by an actual eating and drinking of these elements. Could they possibly put any other construction on words so plain, so simple? And seeing (as I have before said,) the apostles could not, in their own persons, show "the Lord's death till he come," it is manifest that he intended his command to be imperative on all their descendants, those who follow in their footsteps throughout all ages; even as the moral law is imperative on all men?

The ordinances of the Lord are binding on all his genuine fol-

* Luke xxii. 15 18. † Rom. vii. 22.

lowers, as expressions of their faith in, and reliance upon him; but for others to observe them would be to "sin a great sin;" for the apostle says of the supper, "he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself."

You say, "Such a precept appears to contain no sufficient *internal* evidence of its being binding on any persons except those to whom it was actually addressed, and others who were placed under the same particular circumstances." This sir, is a truth, a truth by which "the wrath of man" is made to praise God. The apostles were once exactly in the same circumstances as all other men; and all men are what the apostles once were, sinners. As such, they all stand in need of a Saviour; and this furnishes sufficient evidence that the precept was intended to be binding on all who are similarly situated with the apostles, *i. e.*, on all who, like them, were once unbelievers, but who have been called "out of darkness into marvellous light," after the same manner as they had been.

You say the "*bulk*" of the precepts of Jesus are of universal obligation, because they are moral in their nature; thus implying, nay, almost asserting, that his ordinances were binding only on his immediate disciples. From which we may judge, that the sum total of your claim to the heavenly inheritance is of the same nature as that by which the children of Israel held the land of Canaan — personal obedience to the law; which personal obedience is of itself good, and manifestly tends to earthly happiness, but which alone does not advance the most upright individual one single step towards heavenly joys; for "by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified."*

Again, you say,† "The present argument may be fitly illustrated by another example, of a similar nature;" that of washing one another's feet: which example you yourself illustrate, in plain and correct terms, as follows: "No one supposes that an obedience to such an injunction is necessary for christians of every age and country. Undoubtedly, that mutual respect and benevolence, of which the washing of one another's feet was thus prescribed to some of his servants as an instance and a sign, is universally incumbent on the followers of Jesus. Universally incumbent upon them, also, is that love and allegiance towards their Saviour, and that dependence upon his meritorious death, which the apostles were accustomed to express by their commemorative supper. But in both cases,

* Rom. iii. 20. † Page 114, 115.

according to the view of Friends on the subject, the outward circumstance may be omitted, without any real infraction of the revealed will of God."

Benevolence, sir, as you know well, is a thing that cannot be shown but by some "*outward circumstance.*" It is not a dormant, but an active principle; and, to be effective, must be visible. "By this," says our Lord, "shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."* And what says James? "If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give them not those things which are needful to the body; what doth it profit?"† As we cannot, therefore, render service to our brethren but by an outward act, so neither can we honour Christ in his ordinance, without attending to it as he has commanded, *i. e.*, by the "*outward circumstance*" of literally eating the bread and drinking the wine.

"In confirmation of these general arguments," you say,‡ "the reader's attention may now be called to a very striking fact; namely, that in the gospel of Matthew, which was written by an eye witness, and probably at a still earlier date than that of Luke, and which contains a very exact description of our Lord's last supper with his disciples,—of the breaking of the bread, of the handing of the cup, and of the comparison made by Jesus of the one with his body, and of the other with his blood,—the words upon which *alone* could have been founded the institution of this supposed christian rite, 'Do this in remembrance of me,' *are entirely omitted.* We are not to conclude from this omission that those words were not spoken. That they were spoken, on the contrary, is certain, on the authority of both Luke and Paul. But since Matthew describes all the circumstances of the occasion, and narrates the whole of our Lord's address, with the single exception of these words, we can hardly suppose him to have understood that the precept of Jesus was of that *very leading* importance which is generally imagined, or that our Lord then instituted a rite which was in every age to form an essential part of divine worship, and to be universally obligatory on the professors of christianity. Precisely the same observation applies to the gospel of Mark, which is supposed to have been written under the immediate superintendence of the apostle Peter."

You acknowledge that the words were spoken, and yet, strange to

* John xiii. 35. † James ii. 15, 16. ‡ Page 115.

say, you deny that the command was imperative, although we have positive evidence that, at the first preaching of the apostles, after they had been baptized with the Spirit, the institution was observed by about three thousand converts; and the sacred writer says, "they continued stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." And again, "They continued daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.... And the Lord added to the church *daily* such as should be saved."* From these passages we may infer, that they partook of the supper every day on which new converts were added to them. The apostles were not allowed to conduct their worship unmolested in the temple;† they had therefore to resort to private houses, where they celebrated the ordinance, first in one house, then in another. The next particular we have of its celebration is mentioned Acts xx. 7; "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them," &c.; which indicates that the observance of the ordinance was a *leading* part of christian worship. And although Matthew does not mention the words in question, he mentions two things which no other of the evangelists, nor any of the apostles, mention, *i. e.*, the Lord's last injunction to them:— "Teach all nations, *baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;*" and also, "*teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you.*" According to your argument, none of the apostles thought the injunction as of such leading importance, as at the present day it is generally deemed to be; and yet, they obeyed it. May I ask how it happened that you did not, to strengthen your argument for the "disuse" of baptism, mention this circumstance? Did you think it would not answer your purpose, or did it escape your memory?

The omission of the words of our Lord by Matthew and Mark afford no support to your argument, but the contrary; the words and the circumstances that are supplied by later writers, Luke and Paul, so far from detracting from the importance of the ordinance, make it, if possible, of greater moment. Important particulars respecting a transaction may be omitted by an early writer; but if they are supplied by a subsequent writer of equal authority, we may safely conclude that the particular circumstance in question is of *very*

* See Acts ii. 42. 46, 47. † Acts iv. 1—3.

leading importance. Now, this is the case in the present instance. The Holy Spirit, doubtless, foreseeing how this ordinance might be impugned by such reasoning as yours, took the precaution to guard it, by the testimony of two unimpeachable witnesses, who, by giving our Lord's express command for its observance, and showing its true nature and design, left without excuse all those who trample it under their feet. And those who delight to do his will, to bow to his authority, and through faith to attend to his ordinance with an enlightened understanding, have a lively "hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began."*

You, sir, denominate this important ordinance, — an ordinance which was instituted by the Saviour of the world, to keep alive in the minds of his people the great work he had accomplished for them, — "*a supposed christian rite:*" and no wonder, since you oppose the darkness of the *inward monitor* to the meridian blaze of the Sun of Righteousness. But thus it is written; "Light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."†

"What then," you say, ‡ "may be deemed a fair and reasonable interpretation of our Lord's very simple precept? And in what signification would the twelve apostles, to whom these words were addressed, naturally understand them? In order to give a satisfactory answer to this inquiry, we may in the first instance observe, that those twelve apostles to whom our Lord addressed himself were all Jews or Galileans; that they had long been accustomed to observe the rites of the supper of the passover; and that among those rites were numbered ... the breaking of the bread and the handing of the cup, with the blessing and giving of thanks. As they had already been habituated to these customs, so was the Lord Jesus well aware that they would still maintain them; for, as it has been already remarked, the apostles continued in the practice of parts of the Jewish ritual long after the crucifixion of our Lord; and although that ritual was in fact abolished by his death, the sudden disuse of it does not appear to have been enjoined upon them by their divine Master. Having these facts in our view, we may reasonably interpret the words of Jesus as commanding nothing more than that his apostles should call *him* to their recollection, when they met together to celebrate the supper of the passover. 'This cup,' said Jesus, 'is the New Testament in my blood.' Now, it was

* Tit. i. 2. † John iii. 19. ‡ Page 116.

not every cup of wine which represented the New Testament in the blood of Christ; it was the cup of wine drunk at the supper of the passover—an institution which they were then celebrating, and which, in some of its circumstances, was expressly typical of the death of the Messiah. It appears, then, by no means very improbable, that it was to the cup of the passover exclusively that our Saviour's injunction applied. 'This do ye, *as oft as ye drink it*, in remembrance of me.' That is, as often as ye meet together to celebrate the supper of the passover, and to drink of that cup which represents the New Testament in my blood, take care that ye forget not the true purport of the ceremony—do it in remembrance of *me*.

"Such appears to be an easy and natural interpretation of our Lord's words. Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that they are capable of a sense somewhat more extensive: although the breaking of the bread, the handing of the wine, &c., undoubtedly formed a part of the Jewish ceremonial order of the passover supper, there is reason to believe that a very similar method was observed in the conduct of those more common meals of which the Jews were accustomed to partake in one another's company. (See Luke xxiv. 30, and Acts xxvii. 35.) Such being the common practice of the Jews, it is very probable that the apostles might understand our Lord's injunction as not confined to the passover supper, but as extending to other more familiar occasions, when they might be gathered together to participate in a common meal. On these occasions, as well as at the passover supper, they might consider it a duty laid upon them by their beloved Master, to break their bread and to drink of their cup, not only for the satisfaction of their natural appetites, but in commemoration of the body which was broken, and of the blood which was shed, for their sakes. That the Lord Jesus was thus understood by some of his hearers, may be collected from the known practice of the church at the very earliest period of its history."

The appearance of candour, with the insidious reasoning contained in the above extract, may serve to reconcile those to their trammel, who, through the accidental circumstance of birth, find themselves encircled by it. But any unprejudiced person would easily detect your fallacious proceeding. It is not for me to describe what must have been the compunction which, after you had done your utmost to wrest the words of the Lord, constrained you to make the following confession: "It cannot be denied that they (the words) are capable

of a sense somewhat more extensive;" nor by what means you became so insensible to the compunction, as to withhold from the young of your society how widely that more "extensive sense" differed from your version of it. The eating of the lamb is nowhere in the scriptures denominated the *supper* of the passover; neither is the eating of the bread and the drinking of the wine: the latter is expressly denominated "the Lord's supper," and the former, "the Lord's passover."

When the Almighty issued the precept for observing the passover, he made no mention of bread, save that it should be unleavened; nor does it appear, from the narration of the evangelist,* that breaking and handing round the bread formed any part of the rite. The simple direction given to Moses was, "they shall eat the flesh (of the lamb) in that night, roast with fire, and unleavened bread; and with bitter herbs they shall eat it.... And thus shall ye eat it; with your loins girded, your shoes on your feet, and your staff in your hand: and ye shall eat it in haste; it is the Lord's passover."†

But when the Son of God instituted the ordinance of the supper, he presided at his own table, and set the example how it should thenceforward be celebrated. And as Paul was not present on the occasion, all necessary information on the subject was afterwards revealed to him; as he says to the Corinthians, "I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." Could any two ordinances be more distinctly explained; or be more dissimilar?

Besides, the passover could be observed but once in the year, and that on a particular day of a particular month; and in one place only—Jerusalem: whereas the supper, as I have previously shown, was often observed, and on any day, but more particularly on every Lord's day,‡ when and wherever two or three believers were, as a church, gathered together. You state, that the Lord Jesus was well aware that the apostles would still maintain their former customs; what can we gather from this, but that you bring the

* Luke xxii. 14—18. † Exod. xii. 8. 11. ‡ See Acts xx. 7.

character of the Lord down to your own standard? And as, from some cause or other, you appear to be fearful of giving the more extensive meaning of his words, you may suppose that Jesus, whom you call their *divine* Master, was fearful of commanding them to abstain from observing the old institution, and thenceforth to observe the new, lest they should prove refractory. No man, sir, of common understanding, could confound one of these ordinances with the other, or imagine it *very probable* that he might eat the bread and drink the cup for the satisfaction of his natural appetite. Far less would the inspired apostles,—men whose every thought and action, in respect of the worship of God, was governed by the Holy Spirit,—be likely to confound an ordinary meal with a most solemn ordinance. That they did not so confound them is manifest, from Paul's rebuke of the Corinthians.*

The most cursory reader of the New Testament must know, that it was not every cup of wine which represented the New Testament in the blood of Christ; and also, that it was not the cup of wine drank at the passover, but that which was drank at the Lord's supper, immediately after the bread had been broken and eaten, that represented it. You yourself allow, that the passover was, in some of its circumstances, typical of the death of the Messiah; how then can you imagine that the apostles, after having felt in their own persons the direct efficacy of his blood, should continue to celebrate a rite which was designed to prefigure it.

From your own words, it is manifest that you had some misgivings on the subject, and that the true explanation of our Lord's instruction had flashed upon your mental vision with such effulgence as to make you stagger, and feel the awful responsibility you were bringing on your own head, by attempting to lead others astray. That you were alive to the feeling, may be gathered from what you say;† "We know that in exact proportion with the measure of light bestowed upon us, is the weight, the extent, the awfulness of our responsibility."

Throughout your "observations," you are especially desirous that the junior members of your society, as well as the world in general, should not only believe that all former ordinances have been abolished, but that no new ones have been instituted. Yet, in contradiction to your own observations, you can reasonably interpret the words of Jesus as commanding "that his apostles should call *him* to their recollec-

* 1 Cor. xi. 34. † Page 362.

tion, when they met together to celebrate the supper of the passover," and, consequently, that to you "it appears by *no means very improbable* that it was to the cup of the passover exclusively that our Saviour's injunctions applied." So that you make our Lord say to his apostles, As often as ye meet to celebrate the passover, and drink of that cup which represents the new testament in my blood, *take care* that ye forget not the purport of the ceremony,—do it in remembrance of *me*." Here is a jumble of words, which, if they had been written expressly to bewilder the reader, could not have succeeded better.

That the apostles, (as I have previously observed,) after the death of our Lord, practised some parts of the Jewish ritual, is evident. For when Paul was at Jerusalem, he was informed that evil reports had been spread concerning him; and in order to conciliate the multitude, and counteract their prejudices, James and the elders advised that he should purify himself, with "four men that had a vow on them." The same apostle also circumcised Timothy, because of the Jews that were in those quarters, for they knew all that his father was a Greek. "Him would Paul have to go forth with him;" therefore he circumcised him, knowing that no Jew would listen to an uncircumcised individual. But although Paul, as a matter of *momentary* expediency, did those things, which under the circumstances he might deem himself at liberty to do, in order to forward the work of the ministry, neither he nor any of the apostles required them of their converts. Nor is there a shadow of intimation that, after the resurrection, any of the Lord's genuine followers ate of the paschal lamb; indeed, how could they, when they had the Lord, the antitype of that lamb, to eat of?*

"Of those numerous persons," you say,† "who were converted by means of the ministry of Peter, on the day of Pentecost, we read that 'they continued stedfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.' (Acts ii. 42.) Since the 'breaking of bread' is here mentioned among other signs of religious communion, it probably signifies (according to the general opinion of biblical critics,) *that* breaking of bread, which was introduced as a memorial of the death of Christ. Nevertheless, that the practice in question was observed as a part of the social meal, is evident from the immediate context; 'And all that believed, adds the historian, 'were together, and had all things common... and they continued daily with one accord in the temple, and *breaking bread from house*

* See John vi. 54—56. † Page 118.

to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart.' (Verse 46.) On another occasion, when we are informed that ' on the first day of the week, the disciples at Troas came together to break bread,' (Acts xx. 7,) there is no reason to suppose that they met for the purpose of performing a religious ceremony. It appears rather that they came together to participate in a brotherly repast, of which it is probable that *one* particular object was, the joint commemoration of the death of their Lord. After Paul had taken the opportunity afforded him by this meeting of preaching at length to the disciples, it is obvious that he broke bread with them, in order to the refreshment of his body, and the satisfaction of the demands of nature. ' When he therefore was come up again,' says Luke, ' and *had broken bread and eaten*, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed.' (Verse 11.)"

The supper, which in a former paragraph was denied, is in the above paragraph brought into a sort of half existence, but intermixed with, and partaken of as, a social meal. Why, sir, the individuals who so partake of it are the very persons whom Paul asserts " eat and drink damnation to themselves, not discerning the Lord's body." Nothing so awful, indeed, could attach to a social meal, in whatever manner it was eaten, save that of substituting it for the supper of the Lord, and thus prostituting the holy ordinance. Your argument gains no support from the passages you have quoted, as you yourself, by your doubtful manner of expression, appear to be aware.

When the disciples at Troas came together to break bread, it was evident their object was to worship, for the change of the seventh day to the first had then taken place. This passage, Acts xx. 7, is the first and only positive indication we have of that change, and also of its having been the regular practice of the apostles to celebrate the supper every " first day." Believers, therefore, ought to follow their example, seeing that, by the way in which the subject is adverted to in the above passage, the Lord's day and the Lord's supper were not by the apostles separated. For although neither our Lord nor his apostles have fixed the period by express command, yet the example of the first disciples, and the sanction of the practice by Paul, is for believers a sufficient authority. I do not say that they may not, if they be so inclined, celebrate it on any other day, in addition to the Lord's day, but then it must be when they meet together as a church. Moreover it is said, that " Paul preached unto them, ... and continued his speech until midnight."

Now it is manifest to every impartial person, that the supper, after the example of the Lord, was administered in the evening,* whether by Paul or by one of the disciples, that being the time the lamb was killed;† and also, that being past midnight, and after Paul had healed Eutychus, it was on the following day that he broke bread, and ate, as at a common social meal, in order to enable him to "talk" even till break of day, when he departed.

I think, sir, you have introduced a word into the paragraph I have quoted, for which no sound biblical critic will thank you. Which of them would say, speaking on Acts ii. 42, that the breaking of bread,—a term there mentioned as synonymous with celebrating the supper,—"*probably* signifies that breaking of bread which was introduced as a memorial of the death of Christ." No, no, sir; PROBABLY is a word seldom found in the vocabulary of any one who has "been taught by" Christ "as the truth is in Jesus,"‡—one who is not only not averse, but who is desirous, that others also should be taught after the same manner.

"The same fact," you say,§ "is evident from the description given by Paul of the abuses which had crept in among his Corinthian converts, in their method of conducting these common repasts. 'When ye come together, therefore, into one place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper. For in eating every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken. What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.' (1 Cor. xi. 20—22.) After thus reproving them, and after explaining to them in a passage already cited, the origin and true object of the observance which they had thus abused, the apostle, zealous as he was for the right order of this christian meal, concludes with the following exhortation: 'Wherefore, my brethren, *when ye come together to eat*, tarry one for another; and if any man hunger, let him eat at home; that ye come not together unto condemnation.'"

But, sir, if it were, according to your statement, a "*common repast*," why should the Corinthians have been rebuked for satisfying their hunger? Is not that the object of a repast? The fact that they were enjoined to satisfy their hunger at home, ere they came together, leaves no doubt that their coming together was, by par-

* Matt. xxvi. 20. † See Exod. xii. 6; Numb. ix. 5.
‡ Eph. iv. 21. § Page 119.

taking of the supper, to worship God. Your aim is to detract from the glory of the institution, by degrading it to the level of a common *meal;* and by so doing, you place yourself in the condition of those whom the apostle so severely reproves, and are guilty of the very thing which he condemns. It is quite obvious, indeed, from the apostle's language to those Corinthians, that celebrating the supper is an act of worship, and that it can only be partaken of as such, at the time, and in the place, where believers assemble as a church, and by those only who have been baptized into Christ.

I am not aware that we have any intimation of the immediate disciples of Christ having buildings set apart for christian worship. The apostles preached in the synagogues; but as they were not allowed, as has been shown, to administer the supper in the temple, it may be presumed that they were not allowed to administer it in the synagogues. That it was administered in private houses is certain; for it was instituted in a private house,* and afterwards celebrated by Paul in one.† Equally certain it is, that when it was administered, it was neither partaken of as a common meal, nor after the manner of one. Neither is it anywhere denominated by so low a name as a "*meal.*" Whenever the disciples met for worship, whether in a house or in a barn, they constituted a church of God.

You say,‡ "The supper which the apostle here describes as the Lord's supper, which the Corinthians had so shamefully misconducted, and during the course of which the bread was broken and the wine handed about, in commemoration of the death of Christ, was probably the same as was otherwise denominated 'love,' or the 'supper of love.' 'Their coming together,' says Theophylact, on 1 Cor. xi. 20, (or rather Chrysostom, from whom his commentaries were borrowed,) 'was intended as a sign of love and fellowship; and he *denominates this social banquet the Lord's supper*, because it was the imitation of that awful supper which the Lord eat with his disciples.' These suppers of love, or 'love feasts,' are alluded to by Peter (2 Pet. ii. 13), and by Jude (verse 12), and are described by Pliny ... as well as by Tertullian ... and other early fathers. ... It appears that they were public repasts, of a decent and frugal character, in which the poor and the rich of the early christian churches participated together, and which were considered as being both the symbols and pledges of mutual harmony and brotherly love. Such, then, was the 'Lord's supper' of the primitive christians: such were the occasions on

* Luke xxii. 8—14. † Acts xx. 8. ‡ Page 120.

which they were accustomed to break their bread, and to drink their wine, as a memorial of the body and blood of Christ."

The scriptures, sir, being the standard previously agreed upon between us, we will, if you please, adhere to the text, and cast the writings of Theophylact, Chrysostom, Pliny, Tertullian, and other early fathers, as we have before cast those of the learned, "to the moles and to the bats." They are no authority: on the contrary, the traditions of these men make the commandment of Christ of none effect; as the traditions of the Pharisees did the commandment of God.* You say that the supper was *probably* the same as was denominated the "supper of love;" but as it is a folly to argue on probabilities, I shall pass on to your next paragraph.

"To the simple practice," you proceed to say,† "which thus prevailed among these primitive christians, (if preserved within proper bounds,) there appears to be nothing which can fairly be objected. It was a practice which might be classed rather under the head of pious customs than under that of direct religious ceremonies. It was perhaps little more than giving to one of the common occasions of life a specific direction of an edifying character; and under the peculiar circumstances of these early disciples, it might be considered no inconsistent result of that general law, that whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, all is to be done to the glory of God, and in the *name of the Lord Jesus.* But appropriate as these feasts of charity might be to the condition of the infant church, when the believers were comparatively few in number, and in a considerable degree possessed all things in common, they would evidently be much less adapted for the use of those vast multitudes of persons, very slightly connected with one another, who profess christianity in modern times. As the numbers increased in any church, who would, as members of it, possess a right to attend the *love feasts*, there would necessarily arise a great danger of abuse in such a practice; and that this abuse actually took place in the church of Corinth to an alarming and disgraceful degree, we have already noticed, on the authority of the apostle Paul.

"On the one hand, therefore, we may allow that those persons who continue the observance of the Lord's supper, not as a religious ceremony constituting a necessary part of divine worship, but *on the simple system of the primitive christians*, are not without their warrant, in the example of those christians, for the adoption of such a course.

* Matt. xv. 6. † Pages 121, 122.

On the other hand, it is no less evident, that the apparent unsuitableness of the custom to the present condition of the visible church, its known *liability* to abuse, and more especially its close *affinity* with the abolished practices of the Jewish ritual, afford very strong reasons for its discontinuance."

He, sir, who declared the end from the beginning, saw *no unsuitableness of the custom* to the present day. On the contrary, in every age the Lord has had a seed to serve him;* and it is for the present generation to hand down his ordinance in all its purity to the next. If all the professed followers of Christ had originally done their duty; if they had studied the scriptures with the same intenseness that they have studied to increase their earthly possessions, and acted accordingly, it would have been impossible that they could have so degenerated as they have. There is no standing still: not to progress is to recede. The Bible contains all that is necessary to command the attention, and to further the instruction, of mankind, as long as the world shall last. Our Lord said to his disciples, "Other men laboured, and ye are entered into their labours;"† thus indicating that, as their labour would be lighter, by reason of that of those who had preceded them, they ought therefore to profit by, and improve upon it. If liability to abuse be an argument against the ordinance of the supper, the same argument will hold good against the manifestation of God in the flesh, and serve to show that it would have been better for the world if the Lord had never appeared; for he says, "Think not that I am come to send peace on the earth, but a sword."‡ This was not the purpose of his coming; his purpose was, "to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." But the immediate consequence was, to set the world against his saints, as it had set his kindred and countrymen against himself; thus causing more cruelty and bloodshed than any other thing, save sin.

That the ordinance of the supper is greatly abused and desecrated must be acknowledged and deplored; but this, so far from being a sufficient reason for discontinuing it, should be an additional stimulus to the genuine followers of Christ to observe it according to its original design, and as an example to this and future generations; following the example of Paul, they must show, both to those who eat and drink unworthily, and to those who refuse to eat and drink at all, their error. I have before shown, that this ordinance of Christ

* See Psalm xxii. 30. † John iv. 38. ‡ Matt. x. 34.

has *no affinity* with the abolished rite of the passover. Nevertheless, if it had, and had been commanded of the Lord, there would be the same reason for adhering to his command. The sum of the above extract appears to be, that in your opinion it is anti-scriptural, under any circumstances, to observe the ordinance after the pattern which our Lord left us; but that, if it be observed after the manner of a social meal, it is not only not objectionable, but allowable. Thus you clearly admit, that the writings of such men as Chrysostom, Pliny, Tertullian, and others, are to be preferred before the inspired writings of the gospel. Although you allow,* that the gospel of Christ is "the *power* of God unto salvation,"† "there is a way which seemeth right unto a man, but the end are the ways of death."‡

"That there is nothing," you say,§ "in the history of the origin of that custom which precludes, under so obvious a change of circumstances, *the liberty for its disuse*, the reader will probably allow, for reasons already stated. Here, however, it appears necessary to notice a particular expression of the apostle Paul's, from which many persons have derived an opinion that this practice is obligatory on believers in Jesus *until the end of the world*. 'For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup,' says the apostle, '*ye do show the Lord's death till he come.*' The inference deduced from these words, respecting the *necessary* permanence of the rite of the Lord's supper, appears to be ill-founded. For, in the first place, they contain no *command* to the Corinthians to continue the practice in question until the Lord's coming; and, in the second place, it is evident from the context that it was not here the apostle's object to impress upon his friends the *duration* of the custom, but only its *meaning* or *direction*. The stress of his declaration plainly lies upon the words, '*ye do show the Lord's death:*' the words '*till he come*' were probably added as a kind of reservation, for the purpose of conveying the idea that when the Lord himself should come, such a memorial of his death would be obselete and unnecessary."

This extract, sir, is of too doubtful and quibbling a character to deceive any one, while the very subterfuges to which you have recourse establish the fact which they were intended to subvert. Where would have been the utility of the reservation, or of Paul's seeking to impress upon the mind of his friends its *meaning* or

* Page 24.
† Rom. i. 16.
‡ Prov. xiv. 12.
§ Page 123.

duration, or the fact of its being instituted at all, if the institution was not to be continued? What other inference can be drawn from the expression, 'This do in remembrance of me; for as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," than that the ordinance was to be observed until his second coming should make it void, as the shedding of his blood had made void the observance of the passover? But how are we to account for the change in your opinion? You now argue as if our Lord had actually established a new ordinance, as "*a memorial of his death;*" while hitherto you have argued that it was only the *supper* of the passover that was to remind them of him. Everybody knows that the words, "ye do show the Lord's death till he come," contain *no* command; but everybody knows, also, that the words, "This do ye," contain a very positive one.

I have not yet discovered that you have advanced anything approaching to a scriptural reason why the supper should be discontinued; and you yourself appear to have no confidence in your own statements; if you had, you would have boldly appealed to the gospel, instead of making a diffident appeal to your reader. A very little knowledge of what constitutes a church of Christ, would have enabled you to define a believer, and not to presume that all professors of christianity are faithful followers of Christ.

But, sir, what are we to understand by the words, "*liberty for its disuse*," save that they imply that its use was commanded? All unbelievers not only have that *liberty*, as you term it, but they are warned, under the heaviest denunciations, *not* to eat and drink of it. And as to the believer, he thinks the liberty of sitting down at the Lord's table his highest honour and privilege, because he is conscious that until he obtains that privilege, he cannot be numbered among the friends of his Redeemer.*

We will now notice what was the state of "the *infant church*." At the first preaching of the apostles, three thousand converts were added to it, and very soon afterwards five thousand more; a greater number, so far as we know, than were ever afterwards converted in so short a period. Now, at the present time, as Jeremiah prophesied,† there are, generally speaking, only "one of a city and two of a family," brought to Zion. A church of Christ is not composed of those who are said to be regenerated by baptism, whether in infancy, manhood, or old age; nor of those who profess to enter it

* See John xv. 14. † Jer. iii. 14.

after being sprinkled; nor of those who imagine that they have been born in possession of "an inward monitor;" but of those who believe "to the saving of the soul;"* those who have a "full assurance of hope to the end;"† who have confessed their Lord in baptism; who have received of his Spirit, and eaten of the bread and drank of the wine, as typifying his flesh and blood. If, then, the ordinance of the supper was appropriate to the state of the *infant church*, which was so much more flourishing than it is in the nineteenth century of its existence, surely it should, according to your own showing, be appropriate to it now, as being, on account of the fewness of its numbers, less liable to abuse.

I wish to know what that obvious change of circumstances, to which you allude, is? Men sin now, as they did at the beginning of the gospel. There is the same pharisaical spirit abroad; the same great zeal for tradition; the same great desire that their works may be seen of men; the same enlargement of the borders of their garments, (or, for the same purpose, no borders at all;) the same desire of making proselytes, to make them worse than themselves; the same tithing of mint, and anise, and cummin, the same omissions of the weightier matters of the law; the same straining at gnats, and swallowing camels; the same cleansing of the outside of the cup and platter; the same whited sepulchres, which, indeed, appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and all uncleanness; the same building of the tombs of the prophets, bearing the same witness, that they are the children of those who killed them,‡ and the same hatred of all who "have been taught" by Christ "as the truth is in Jesus." And do not all men now stand in the same need of a Saviour; of the same instructions as are contained in the gospel; of the same "obedience to the faith," and of the same attention to the ordinances, as the men of primitive times?

You say,§ "It appears from various passages in the epistles that the early christians, and even the apostle Paul himself, lived under a strong impression that the coming of Christ in glory was *near at hand*. But although this impression, on a point professedly not revealed to any of the inspired servants of God (Matt. xxiv. 36,) was erroneous, there is a sense in which it may be truly declared that the Lord Jesus is already *come again*. He is come in those spiritual manifestations of his divine presence, by which his faithful

* Heb. x. 39. † Heb. vi. 11.
‡ See Matt. xxiii. § Page 123.

disciples, in every age, are upheld, strengthened, and comforted. While I by no means intend to assert that this is the second appearance of Christ to which Paul is here alluding, I cannot but remark, that the *principle* on which he upholds the coming of our Lord, as the termination of the outward ordinance, is plainly consistent with the sentiment of Friends, that the spiritual manifestations of the Lord Jesus, and the direct communion with him enjoyed by his obedient followers, virtually abrogates any practice in his service which is of a merely symbolical or typical character."

It would have been much more satisfactory to your readers, sir, if you had referred them to some of those passages, which intimate that Paul lived under a strong impression that the coming of the Lord was *near at hand*. To me it seems like pouring contempt on the Holy Spirit to assert, that the instrument which he made use of to declare his will should not only incite erroneous impressions in the minds of those to whom he wrote, but that those who were immediately under his influence should be led into error upon such an important point as this. But Paul himself confutes your statement. Writing to the Thessalonians, he says, "We beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.... Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our epistle."*

It was on the day of Pentecost that the first and great spiritual manifestation of the Lord Jesus was experienced by man; and it was then also that the disciples first enjoyed direct spiritual communion with him. It was then that, for the first time, they celebrated the Lord's supper, by breaking the bread and drinking the cup in remembrance of his death; while all believers have, without change, decrease, or increase, precisely the same spiritual manifestation (with the exception of outward gifts) as all the first followers of Christ had.† And this same manifestation must continue till the end of time.‡ But when, through the triumph of antichrist, the witnesses shall be slain, the manifestation will be so limited as to appear almost

* 2 Thess. ii. 1—3, 15. † See John xiv. 21.
‡ Matt. xxviii. 20.

extinct. But when they shall stand again "upon their feet,"* the same spiritual manifestation shall revive, and go forth to an extent ten thousand times greater than it has hitherto done.† This will be the day of Christ mentioned in 2 Thess. ii. 2, the commencement of his reign on earth by the power of his gospel; and very terrible will that commencement be.‡ For "he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked."§ This last passage evidently applies to the aged and hardened sinners of that day; and the remainder of the chapter to the happy state of the rising generations, who shall all be brought to the knowledge of the Lord.‖ That the ordinances of Christ must remain in full force until his personal coming is evident, from Matt. xxviii. 20, 1 Cor. xi. 26, and Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

Instead of believing that antichrist is an individual, or the descendant of an individual, we ought rather, seeing there were many antichrists in John's day,¶ to believe that what is termed antichrist includes the whole body of those who have the gospel in their hands, and yet worship contrary to its precepts; and that this body is "that man of sin," "the mystery of iniquity," which is to be revealed,** previous to that great day, "when all the people will walk every one in the name of his God."††

How, then, sir, can you advocate the sentiment of Friends—that the spiritual manifestation of the Lord virtually abrogates any practice of a typical character? "But wisdom is justified of her children." It is indeed of little consequence what errors those adopt who receive "not the love of the truth, that they might be saved." For, "for this cause God shall send them strong delusions, that they should believe a lie."‡‡ You speak a truth, sir, which "flesh and blood hath not revealed,"—a truth which those who reject or degrade the gospel have never experienced,—when you say, the Lord "is come in those spiritual manifestations of his divine presence by which his faithful disciples in every age are upheld."

Again;§§ "The view now taken of the apostle's doctrine will fitly introduce a concluding observation; that while Friends consider it to be their duty to abstain from that ritual participation in bread and wine, so usually observed among their fellow christians,

* Rev. xi. 11. † See Heb. viii. 11.
‡ See Ps. l.; Isa. ii. 11—19; xxiv. 17—21; Rev. vi. 15—17, and viii. ix. xi. xiv. xvi. and xix. chapters. § Isa. xi. 4. ‖ See Isa. lx.; Heb. viii. 11.
¶ 1 John ii. 18. ** 2 Thess. ii. 2—12. †† Micah iv. 5.
‡‡ 2 Thess. ii. 10, 11. §§ Page 124.

there are no persons who insist more strongly than they do on that which they deem to be the only needful *supper of the Lord.* That supper, according to their apprehension, is altogether of a spiritual nature."

"What fellowship," asks Paul, "hath righteousness with unrighteousness, and what communion hath light with darkness?"* Thus testifying that those "which follow the Lamb whithersoever he goeth," can have no fellowship with those who reject his ordinances, and who, consequently, can have no claim to the name of christian.† All genuine disciples of Christ know that he intended them to feed upon him;‡ that is, to derive all their spiritual support and comfort from him alone; and that when he instituted the ordinance of the supper, it was his will that they should manifest their faith by typically feeding on him, in partaking of the bread and wine. He did not leave it to the direction of any man, nor of any sect, to alter his decree, nor to *deem* that unnecessary which he not only thought necessary, but which he commanded to be observed.§

Those, therefore, who consider it their duty to discountenance the observance of his institution, trample on his authority, and unequivocally prove that they are not his followers. To such it is said, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?"‖ "For them that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall be lightly esteemed."¶

"On a general review, then," you say,** "of the particular passages of the New Testament which relate to the observance of the Lord's supper, I may venture to recapitulate my own sentiments, that such a practice has no proper or necessary connexion with a spiritual feeding on the body and blood of Christ; that the history of our Lord's last paschal supper with his disciples affords no reason for believing that he then instituted a religious ceremony, which was thenceforth to form an essential part of the worship of christians; that our Lord's injunctions on that occasion may be understood either as relating solely to the rites of the passover, or as intended to give a religious direction to the more common social repasts of his disciples; that it was in connexion with such repasts, and particularly with their love-feasts, that the primitive christians were accustomed to commemorate the death of Christ; that the custom of those love-feasts, however appropriate to the circumstances of the

* 2 Cor. vi. 14. † Acts xi 21. 26.
‡ John vi. 54—57. § Rev. xxii. 19. ‖ Luke vi. 46.
¶ 1 Sam. ii. 30. ** Page 126.

earliest disciples, soon fell into abuse as the numbers of believers increased; and appears to be in a great degree inapplicable to the present condition of the christian world; and, lastly, that under the influence of the spiritual manifestations of our Redeemer; we may participate in that *true* supper of the Lord which he has himself so clearly upheld to the expectation of his disciples, and which alone is indispensable for the edification, consolation, and salvation of his people."

All that you have advanced, sir, worthy of notice, in the above paragraph, I have previously refuted. Very little more, therefore, is required to be said upon it. The awful denunciation against those who should profane the ordinance, obviously marks its infinite superiority to, and difference from, everything of a nature merely earthly or temporary, or of human authority; and can only be applicable to that which is of divine original, and which now forms an essential part of christian worship.

We have no scriptural account of the "love-feasts," of which you speak; one or two remarks respecting them, therefore, must suffice. Jude mentions "feasts of charity," and describes in the following caustic language the characters that had unawares crept in among the saints. "These," says he, "are spots in your feasts, ... trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots: raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own shame; wandering stars, to whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever."* What a horrific description, sir, of men, who must have borne about them some *outward* show of christianity, or they could not have so imposed upon the saints, as to obtain admittance to their feasts. Now, sir, if I were to concede to you, which I do not, that these feasts of charity were identical with the Lord's supper, the conduct of such reprobates as these could, as I have before shown, furnish no justification to the true disciples of Christ for discontinuing the ordinance. On the contrary, it would rather induce them to discriminate with more care the characters of those whom they admitted among them, and to celebrate the ordinance with more humility and reverence, and in exact conformity to the divine pattern. Thus would they set an example to the world, and obtain the praise, together with the promise, which the God of Israel gave to the church of Philadelphia: "Thou hast a little strength, and hast kept my word, and hast not denied my name.

* Verses 12, 13.

Behold, I will make them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews, and are not, but do lie; behold, I will make them to come and worship before thy feet, and to know that I have loved thee. Because thou hast kept the word of my patience, I also will keep thee from the hour of temptation, which shall come upon all the world."*

The Corinthians also abused the ordinance, and if your argument have any weight, Paul ought to have commanded them to discontinue it. But did he so command them? No. On the contrary, notwithstanding he reproved them in this instance, he still addressed them, seeing they had been baptized in faith, as "sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints;"† and exhorted them to persevere, saying, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup.... And if any man hunger, let him eat at home, that ye may not come together to condemnation." And he further exhorted them to put away from among themselves the incestuous and wicked person.‡

I cannot but regard your "Observations," sir, as at once devious and contradictory. At one time you argue that the passover supper was the only thing to be attended to; at another, you speak of the Lord's supper, which, in your "general review," you designate the *true* supper of the Lord. Then you merge them into one, and contend, if I understand you rightly, that, whatever designation you give it, it is to be partaken of only as a common meal. But, sir, I find in the gospel no record of any other way of partaking of the supper than that mentioned by the evangelist, and by the apostle Paul; and this way you will not follow, but prefer "walking after the imagination of your own heart." Your own imagination, sir, it must be, seeing we have had no new revelation from heaven since the days of our Lord and his contemporary disciples. And, in the absence of this, we cannot resist the conclusion, that the ordinances which were enjoined on the church then, are not only binding on the church now, but must be through all succeeding generations. And when any body of people, be their pretensions to spirituality what they may, reject them, they cannot constitute a church of Christ. "There are many devices in a man's heart; nevertheless, the counsel of the Lord, that shall stand."§

"Although, for the reasons detailed in the present disquisition,"

* Rev. iii. 8—10.
† 1 Cor. i, 2.
‡ 1 Cor. v. 5, 13.
§ Prov. xix. 21.

you say,* "it may fairly be concluded that the practices of water baptism and the Lord's supper are by no means needful, it is certain that these practices have been very generally observed by the professors of the christian name. This fact is easily explained, not only by the known power of example and tradition, but also by that principle in our nature which leads us so commonly to place our dependence upon outward and visible things. Man is naturally prone to trust in anything rather than in the invisible Creator, and he is ever ready to make the formal ordinance a part of his religious system; because he can rely upon it with ease to himself, and may often find in it a plausible substitute for the mortification of his own will. Now, I would suggest that the ordinances which we have been considering, so far from being like the moral law of God, *universally* salutary, are evidently fraught with no little danger, as occasions by which this deceitful disposition in the human heart is naturally excited and brought into action. And here our appeal may be made, not only to theory, but to facts; for it is indisputable that the outward rites of baptism and the supper, as observed among the professors of christianity, have been the means of leading multitudes into gross superstition. How many thousands of persons are there, as every spiritually minded christian will allow, who place upon these outward rites a reliance which is warranted neither by reason nor by scripture, and which, so far from bringing them nearer to God; so far from reminding them of Christ; operates in the most palpable manner as a *diversion* from a true and living faith in their Creator and Redeemer. How often has the ignorant sinner, even in the hour of death, depended on the 'sacrament' of the Lord's supper as upon a saving ordinance; and how many a learned theologian, both ancient and modern, has been found to insist on the dangerous tenet, that the rite of baptism is *regeneration*."

I have not yet discovered, sir, that you have given any scriptural reason for concluding that the ordinances of the Lord "are by no means needful." Your chief argument to bring them into disrepute is, the abuse of them; but this surely cannot detract from their utility. Solomon declares, that "a wholesome tongue is a tree of life;"† and yet the apostle James says, "The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity; so is the tongue among our members, it defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the course of nature, and it is set on fire of hell.... It is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison."‡

* Pages 127, 128. † Prov. xv. 4. ‡ James iii. 6—8.

According to your argument, therefore, it would be better if mankind had been born dumb. Your suggestion, sir, we shall pass over; since you make no distinction between a believer in Christ, and a mere formal professor.

You draw a comparison between the ordinances of Christ, which are the ground work of his gospel, and the "moral law of God." The latter, you say, is *universally* salutary. "Wherefore," asks Paul, "then serveth the law?" He answers, "It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God it is evident, for, The just shall live by faith."* "Because the law worketh wrath, for where no law is, there is no transgression."† But the former, you say, "is fraught with no little danger;" although the Lord, the Saviour of the world, calls upon *every man* to "repent, and believe the gospel,"‡ and declares that "he that believeth, and *is baptized*, shall be saved." Now, sir, I call upon you to show, if the rejection of the ordinances may not be explained upon the same principle as the false observance of them, *i. e.*, by the power of example and tradition. Is your society, or are you yourself, quite exempt from placing dependence on outward and visible things — things, indeed, in which you differ from every other body of people? And is not the generality of your worship without even the form of godliness — without anything ordained of God, either in the Old or New Testament? And is not your whole religious system a denial of revelation? Does not the body of Friends trust to the instruction of the "inward monitor," in preference to that which is contained in the gospel? Do they not set up this in opposition to the Spirit of the living God; and proclaim to the world that the ordinances instituted by the Lord of life "are by no means needful," but fraught with danger? And is it not a fact, that the rejection of ordinances has led your people into as *gross* superstition, as the people of other sects have been led into by their unscriptural observance of them?

At Antioch, where the disciples were first called christians, a great number believed, and turned to the Lord.§ Thus was Isaiah's prophecy in part fulfilled.‖ Now, it is with the subjects of the Most High as it is with the subjects of earthly potentates. No one is entitled to the name of soldier, until he puts on the king's uniform;

* Gal. iii. 19. 11. † Rom. iv. 15. ‡ Mark i. 15.
§ Acts xi. 26, 21. ‖ See Isa. lxii. 2.

so no one is entitled to the name of christian until he is prepared to, and has, put on the uniform of Christ, by being baptized in water, thus publicly showing himself in his new clothing. As it is said by Paul, "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."*

It is but too true that many of the professors of christianity have grossly abused, and are still grossly abusing, the divine ordinances. They do not understand the object of their institution, and therefore ascribe to them an inherent virtue which they do not possess. This is certainly a great delusion, and has, without doubt, proved fatal to myriads. The application of water simply cannot purify the conscience, neither can the mere partaking of bread and wine feed the soul; it is their being commanded of Christ which makes them imperative upon every believer; the former, as the outward means of introducing him into the church, the latter, as a representation of feeding upon his flesh and blood. In baptism, we confess his name, and avouch the Lord to be our God; in partaking of the supper, we keep in remembrance the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and acknowledge that all our spiritual support is derived from him.

"While," you say,† "the Society of Friends believe that ordinances which are so peculiarly liable to abuse, and which have been the means of exciting not only the superstitions now alluded to, but endless divisions and contentions, and many cruel persecutions in the church, cannot truly appertain to the law of God; while they are persuaded, on the contrary, that the spirituality of that law is opposed to the continued observance of any typical religious rite; and while on these grounds they consider themselves amply justified in the omission of such practices, they entertain, I trust, no disposition whatever to judge their fellow christians, who conscientiously make use of these ceremonies. They are, it may be hoped, too well aware of the importance of obedience to the Lord Jesus, to condemn others, who, from their very desire to obey him, are led to differ from themselves. For my own part, I am persuaded that there are many persons who avail themselves of the rites in question on principles which cannot be deemed superstitious, and who even derive, through these *signs* and *memorials*, a real instruction and edification. Such instances may serve to convince us that God continues to accept the sincere heart, and that he is still pleased to bless a variety of means to a variety of conditions. Nevertheless, I cannot but deem

* Gal. iii. 27.

† Page 128.

it probable that there are many christians, not of our profession, who, as they draw yet nearer in spirit to an omnipresent Deity, will be permitted to find, in *the disuse of all types*, 'a more excellent way.'"

If the ordinances be not of God, for the reasons which you state, then the same reasons, as I have before shown, might be brought forward to show that Christ Jesus was not the Messias, for he has been, and still is, the cause of "endless divisions and contentions."* Your "inward monitor" must be a very uncertain instructor, if it teach you on the one hand to condemn the ordinances, and on the other to justify them,—to make you, like some of the people at Laodicea, neither hot nor cold.† If the ordinances are commanded of God, those *only* who observe them after the manner prescribed are obedient to his will; if they are not commanded of God, the observance of them is a wicked and superstitious act.

That you cannot shelter your peculiarities under the wings of unanimity, has been recently manifested; there have been, even in your society, divisions and contentions of the most bitter character; aye, and persecutions, also, of the worst and most deadly sort —authoritatively closing the mouths of ministers, and putting a restraint upon members. And for what?—"Tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon,"—the former for defending the Bible, and the latter for assembling together to read it. Thus you, sir,—for you yourself (as is reported,) took a prominent part in the persecution,—forbid your people, especially the youth of your societies, to instruct themselves; in order, I presume, that they may be trained the more readily to follow their leaders, among whom you are reckoned, if not the chief, yet among the chiefest.

Your statement, that the instances you mention serve to convince us that God continues to accept the sincere heart, is a mere assertion, unsupported by proof. Men's consciences, as I have before observed, particularly in religious matters, are generally influenced by the creed of their parents, or of those among whom they have been educated. Consequently, the youth of your society, being taught from their infancy to reject the ordinances, would think it sinful to embrace them; and, *vice versa*, those who have been taught to embrace them, would think it sinful to reject them; notwithstanding one might be as far from the truth as the other. Abimelech would have sinned, if he had come near to Abraham's wife, although it would have been in the "sincerity of his heart."‡ There can be

* See Matt. x. 34, 35. † See Rev. iii. 15, 16. ‡ Gen. xx. 1—6.

little doubt but that Uzza was sincere, and thought to do God service, when "he put forth his hand to the ark;" yet it was for this error that he was struck dead on the instant.* Paul, also, was doubtless as sincere when he was a persecutor of the church of God,—and, according to his own account, the chief of sinners,†—as when he magnified his office as the apostle of the Gentiles; yet he was not accepted until he had, in a miraculous manner, been "called out of darkness into marvellous light." These examples controvert your statement, and clearly prove that *mere* sincerity is in the sight of God unavailable; and that, in this respect, the only thing pleasing to the All-wise is "the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth,"‡ manifesting itself in a scriptural observance of his ordinances.

Man is a creature of habit and circumstances: his first impressions are received, and his nature is formed, by the instruction and example of those immediately around him, and especially as it regards forms of worship. Is it not something of this sort that the apostle means when he says, "We are by nature the children of wrath, even as others."§ I admit that the young are not accountable for this; but if, when they grow up to manhood, they fail to bring their first impressions to the standard of the scriptures, with a view to ascertain whether they be right or wrong, and to act accordingly, they then become blameworthy, and subject to condemnation. On things relating to the eternal welfare of the soul, not one man of a thousand thinks seriously for himself. The sentiments in which he has been educated he generally continues to hold, and remains in a state of pupilage as long as he lives; it is not unusual for some, indeed, when they become rich, to go over to those whose sentiments are more fashionable, and, of course, more popular. And in this even they may imagine themselves sincere; as did the late John Newton, for instance, who preferred the religion of the State to that of any of the Dissenters, merely because he thought it gave him greater scope for usefulness.

The same observations apply to our consciousness of right and wrong. The Pharisees deemed it a greater sin to violate the tradition of the elders than to transgress the commandments of God. Even Paul at one time verily thought that he "ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth."‖ An individual may commit an offence, either against the law of God or the law of

* 2 Sam. vi. 7. † 1 Tim. i. 15. ‡ 1 Cor. v. 8.
§ Eph. ii. 3. ‖ Acts xxvi. 9.

his country, without his conscience accusing him. Thus an unqualified person may kill a hare or a partridge, and think he does no wrong; and the simple act itself would not be criminal, if the game laws were not in force: the breach of those laws constitutes the crime, and subjects the individual to the penalty attached to it. Now, if he were brought to trial, and should plead not guilty, on the ground that his conscience did not accuse him, the judge would think the plea rather an aggravation of the offence, as adding contumacy to crime, and would pass sentence on him accordingly; for, while any law of a merely civil nature exists, let its attendant evils be what they may, every man, and especially the christian, is bound to respect it. Similar consequences must be the result of the infraction of any of the laws of God. Thus Moses, when admonishing the Jews, says, "And [lest] it come to pass, when he heareth the words of this curse, that he bless himself in his heart, saying, I shall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of my heart to add drunkenness to thirst: the Lord will not spare him, but then the anger of the Lord and his jealousy shall smoke against that man, and all the curses that are written in this book shall lie upon him, and the Lord shall blot out his name from under heaven;... because they have forsaken the covenant of the Lord God."* And are not all those who forsake his plain commandments, under the pretence of seeking "*a more excellent way*," included in the following address? "Behold, all ye that kindle a fire, that compass yourselves about with sparks; walk in the light of your fire, and in the sparks that ye have kindled. This shall ye have of mine hand, ye shall lie down in sorrow."†

You have previously said, sir, that there is no reason for believing that our Lord instituted these religious ceremonies to form a part of the worship of christians. According to your own views, therefore, the observance of them must, at least, be without the authority of his commands. With what consistency, then, can you now say, that "many persons, who avail themselves of the rites in question, derive through these *signs* and *memorials* a *real* instruction and edification," when to such it is said, (if we admit your argument to have any weight, which we do not,) "Who hath required this at your hand?"‡ "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."§ I am at a loss to conceive how you can

* Deut. xxix. 19, 20. 25. † Isa. l. 11. ‡ Isa. i. 12. § Matt. xv. 9.

view such conduct,—conduct that "you are persuaded is opposed to the spirituality of the law," even with all your charity,—in any other light than as mere will-worship, derogatory to the honour of the Most High. And you must excuse my putting the following question. If you are indeed persuaded that the spirituality of the law is opposed to the continued observance of all typical religious rites, why are you so anxious to justify yourself for the omission of them, as, throughout your "Observations," you appear to be?

There can be no acceptable sincerity, sir, but that which is influenced by the Spirit of God; nor can there be any variety of means, but such as are taught by his word. We read only "of one heart and one way;"* one "common salvation;"† one "common faith;"‡ "one spirit, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel."§ "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit;... that there should be no schism in the body."‖ "For ye are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus."¶ Neither, according to the apostle Paul, can there be any variety of conditions; for, writing to the Romans, he says, "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin."** Neither can any man be a christian, who is not a genuine follower of Christ.†† The Lord himself clearly defines what constitutes a christian, where he says to the believing Jews, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed."‡‡ "Neither," said Peter, "is there salvation in any other."§§ "He," said Paul, "abideth faithful; he cannot deny himself."‖‖ It is not possible, therefore, for those who reject his ordinances to find the "more excellent way." Paul shows the more excellent way to be love,—love which is manifested by obedience,—as our Lord affirms, "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me, shall be loved of my Father; and I will love him, and will manifest myself to him."¶¶

Speaking, "On the nature and character of the christian ministry," you say,*** "Friends are not therefore satisfied with any general

* Jer. xxxii. 39. † Jude 3. ‡ Tit. i. 4. § Phil. i. 27.
‖ 1 Cor. xii. 13. 25. ¶ Gal. iii. 26. ** Rom. iii. 9.
†† Acts xi. 26. ‡‡ John viii. 31. §§ Acts iv. 12.
‖‖ 2 Tim. ii. 13. ¶¶ John xiv. 21. *** Page 134.

impression that it is their duty to preach the gospel; nor do they venture, under such impression, either to employ their own intellectual exertions as a preparation for the service, or to select their own time for performing it. If it be the Divine will that they should minister, they believe that it will be manifested to them by the divine Spirit 'when they are to speak, whom they are to address, and what things they are to express.'" Further on, you say,* "the ministry, according to the apprehension of Friends, ought never to be brought into exercise, unless it be suggested, ordered, and directed of the Lord; since, as far as is consistent with the infirmity of the instrument, it thus assumes, in their view, the character of a divine work; and since the influence which alone leads into such a work is in no degree placed under their authority, it necessarily follows that they cannot interfere in any of the preceding steps—in the selection, preparation, and appointment of the ministers of the gospel. They conceive that it is the undivided prerogative of the Great Head of the church himself to choose, to prepare, and to ordain his own ministers." Again,† "It is the Lord alone (as I have already endeavoured to explain,) who selects the ministers of the gospel, and that until the work be actually commenced, the Society is ignorant who have been selected. Those who, like Friends, allow that *he* only can choose his ministers, must also allow, as a necessary consequence, that *he* only can prepare them. The principle which excludes the interference of man in the one particular, plainly excludes it in the other also." And again,‡ "They (the ministers) know that man has no right to interfere with their appointment; and they dare not look to him for their warrant and authority: it is their Lord and their Redeemer who has invested them with their office, and to him alone they are responsible for its execution."

And again,§ "Since Friends allow of no audible administrations in connexion with public worship, except such as arise out of the immediate impressions of the Holy Spirit, it is evident that when those impressions are withheld or withdrawn, and at all times except during the actual utterance of ministry, their assemblies must continue in a state of silence. When they meet together for the solemn purpose of worshipping their common Lord and Father, they dare not rush into his sacred presence with offerings of confession, prayer, and praise, prepared beforehand, or extemporaneously invented. They sit down, therefore, in reverent stillness, before

* Page 168. † Page 175. ‡ Page 181. § Page 228.

him, and whenever it happens that no one present possesses a gift in the ministry, or that the individuals who possess such a gift are not called into the exercise of it, the silence with which the meeting commences continues uninterrupted until the time arrives for its separation."

If I understand the foregoing extracts rightly, every member who speaks in your meetings is supposed to be directed by the "monitor" that is within him; that until he speak, the society is ignorant who has been selected to minister to them; and that the opening of his mouth determines the matter, and makes the speaker a preacher independent of the society, and prevents the society interfering with him. But then, in opposition to the above, you say,* "Let it not, however, be imagined that, in the decision of the question, *whether or not he is truly appointed to that office*, the minister is to depend exclusively on his own judgment. Christians are ever to be subject to one another in love; and it must in great measure devolve on their brethren to determine whether those who speak the word are rightly invested with their functions, or whether their communications rest on no better foundation than their own will."

Thus does it not appear, that although your society profess not to take upon themselves the responsibility of choosing a minister, they take upon themselves the responsibility of judging him after he is supposed to be chosen? And may I not also ask, Upon what principle can they arrogate to themselves this power, seeing they virtually repudiate the scriptures, the only standard by which he can be rightly judged? By their own laws, the minister has as just a claim to be believed that he speaks according as he is moved, as the society have to believe the contrary.

By your own showing, what you call the inward monitor is an unsteady, uncertain, and unsafe instructor, which acts entirely independent of your control. How is it then, allow me to ask, that you, in the face of your own declaration, select your own time for preaching, and that you can ascertain, previous to inviting the neighbours to your "religious gatherings," that the monitor within will influence you, at the place, the hour, and the minute that you may please to appoint? When you were instructing in Liverpool, I do not recollect hearing that it ever disappointed you. Is not this strange, and at variance with your description of its vacillating character. Uncertainty is confounded with certainty, and your whole argument proves your "inward monitor" to be nothing more

* Page 181.

than an imagination of the brain, set up in opposition to "the Spirit of Truth which proceedeth from the Father,"* whose influences, when once bestowed, are never withdrawn.†

Friends, you remark, are not satisfied that it is their duty to preach the gospel, nor do they venture either to employ their intellectual exertions as a preparation for the same, or *select their own time for performing it.* The latter, your practice positively denies. And is it any wonder, sir, that Friends are not so satisfied, while they do not, or pretend not to, understand the gospel, and while they act and teach contrary to its injunctions? Our Lord sent his disciples "to teach all nations;" and the apostle Paul thus writes to Timothy, "*Study* to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane and vain babblings."‡ "I charge thee, therefore, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom, Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come, when they will not endure sound doctrine."§

I am no little surprised at the following remark,‖ "We regard the members of that church (the Anglican) with a friendly eye, and rejoice in the evident extension of true religion within her borders." "Doth a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?"¶ Where, sir, I would ask, is your consistency? where your rectitude? Have you forgotten what you had before said,** "that much of the ministry actually employed within the borders of the established church is the production of human effort; that it is universally understood to have no other origin; and that nothing whatever of immediate inspiration, in connexion with the work, is either expected by the preacher, or required by his hearers:"—that "the choice of the individual who is afterwards to proclaim to others the glad tidings of salvation is very usually understood to rest with his parents, with his friends, or with himself. With respect to *preparation*, nothing is required, for the most part, but the passing of a few years at one of the universities, in order to the attainment of mathematical and classical literature, and of a certain moderate stock of theological knowledge."

* See John xv. 26. † John xiv. 16; 1 John ii. 27.
‡ 2 Tim. ii. 15, 16. § 2 Tim. iv. 1—3. ‖ Page 213.
¶ James iii. 11. ** Page 160.

Or have you forgotten the appeal you make* to facts, that "it is indisputable that the outward rites of baptism and the supper, as observed among the professors of christianity, have been the means of leading multitudes into gross superstition. How many thousands of persons are there, as every spiritually minded christian will allow, who place upon these outward rites a reliance which is warranted neither by reason nor by scripture, and which, so far from bringing them nearer to God, so far from reminding them of Christ, operates in the most palpable manner as a *diversion* from a true and living faith in their Creator and Redeemer. How often has the ignorant sinner, even in the hour of death, depended on the 'sacrament' of the Lord's supper, as upon a saving ordinance; and how many a learned theologian, both ancient and modern, has been found to insist on the dangerous tenet, that the rite of baptism is *regeneration!*" And yet

You can "rejoice in the evident extension of *true* religion within her borders;"—within the borders of that church, every curate of which *is bound*, on timely notice being given, to administer the "sacrament" to the sick and dying; aye, and further, if it be "humbly and heartily desired," to *absolve them from all their sins;*— of that church, every minister of which, subscribes and swears that he will administer the rite of baptism according to the prayer-book, which prayer-book inculcates the dogma that every baptized child is regenerated.

What says the Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore, in his charge to his clergy,† published June, 1842? "That the people of the church would (if baptism were celebrated at the font, publicly, before the congregation, immediately after the last lesson, at morning or evening prayer,) be habituated to connect the idea of regeneration or the new birth with the admission of children into her fold by holy baptism, when they heard her, by her minister, taking the Saviour's declaration concerning the necessity of 'any one being born again of water and of the Holy Ghost,' for the foundation of her baptismal service; praying that 'the child now to be baptized may be regenerate,' affirming that 'after he is baptized he is regenerate,' thanking God that 'he has been pleased by baptism to regenerate him or her.'"

Allow me to ask, sir, what has now caused such a change in your opinions? What new light has shone upon your mind? Are not

* Page 128. † Pages 29, 30.

the things you previously reprobated in that church still continued, still enforced? Witness the prosecution of the rector of Honiton and the vicar of Liskeard, by the bishop of Exeter. It is true that many of the clergy kick against the antiscriptural dogma of baptismal regeneration, as well as other of its dogmas; and some of them go so far as to say, "there has been in the protestant church much of superstition in holding it."* But is it not disingenuous and dishonourable, in those who continue to receive the pay of the church, and to practise the rites within her pale, to declaim against its superstition, while they themselves, by remaining in it, and by having promised to administer baptism according to the form prescribed, virtually, if not actually, acknowledge and advance the superstition? Had you not these declaimers in your mind, when you wrote the paragraph I have just quoted? But where, sir, is their independence? where their integrity? An upright, conscientious, and consistent regard to the truth, one might suppose, would lead such men to throw off the chains in which they are voluntarily held, and "come out" from the superstition which they unequivocally condemn. By such a course, they would free themselves from such well deserved episcopalian satire as the following:—

"Let us beware of the disorderly and innovating spirit of those who, disapproving of some sentiment or expression in the Book of Common Prayer, and being unwilling therefore to give it utterance from their lips, mould the phraseology of the church into a form more agreeable to their own private opinions. Thus the avowed doctrine and unequivocal declaration of our liturgy concerning the regenerating grace of holy baptism have been qualified into a sort of conformity with the scruples of the church's modern puritanical ministers, and her charitable expression of hope for the departed sinner has been suspended from the burial service, in order that she might be made to speak a language more in harmony with the judicial decision of her less merciful sons. Remarkable examples these of christian simplicity and truth, and of that tenderness of conscience, which thus sensitively recoils from the use of unpleasing language, but nevertheless, on admission into the ministry, acquiesces in a profession of assent and consent to the same language, and in a solemn promise to use it, and is still satisfied to retain a position in the ministry on the continued pledge of that assent and consent."†

* See Bickersteth's Treatise on Baptism, page 294.

† See Bishop of Down and Connor and Dromore, Charge to his Clergy, page 50, July, 1842.

Still, however, there is a general charge given by the rulers of this Anglican church to their subordinates, which has certainly some appearance of affinity with your views of the spiritual eating of the supper. It runs thus; "If a man, either by reason of extremity of sickness, or for want of warning in due time to the curate, or for lack of company to receive with him, or by any other just impediment, do not receive the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, the curate shall instruct him that if he do truly repent him of his sins, and stedfastly believe that Jesus Christ has suffered death upon the cross for him, and shed his blood for his redemption, earnestly remembering the benefits he has thereby, and giving him hearty thanks therefore, he doth eat and drink the body and blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the sacrament with his mouth."*

However, it is possible that some one or other of the clergy may have persuaded you, and also himself, that he has renounced the things which you condemn. He may so think; but if he does, I see not how he can escape the charge of hyprocrisy; for although he may surreptitiously garble or omit certain passages in the baptismal and burial services, and thus violate his vows; he is nevertheless bound not only to see that the children under his charge are taught the catechism, which makes each child say, "I was made," in my baptism, "a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven," but that, whenever the bishop shall require it, "he shall either bring or send in writing, with his hand subscribed thereunto, the names of all such persons within his parish as he shall think fit to be presented to the bishop to be confirmed," *i. e.*, of such who "can SAY, in their mother tongue, the creed, the Lord's prayer, and the ten commandments, and also can answer to the questions of the short catechism." So that in whatever manner the conduct of such a clergyman may be viewed, can we come to any other conclusion than that, like Balaam, he loves and receives "the wages of unrighteousness"?† If there were any sincerity among the clergy so acting, would they not follow the advice contained in 2 Cor. vi. 17, 18, and by so doing prove it? This, indeed, is the only way they have of establishing their characters as dissentients from "The Book of Common Prayer."

"We," you say,‡ "encourage a liberal and friendly feeling towards our fellow christians of *every denomination*."

* Communion of the Sick. † 2 Peter ii. 15. ‡ Page 214.

Thus, sir, after the manner of the prophetesses mentioned by Ezekiel,* you "sew pillows to all arm-holes, and make kerchiefs upon the head of every stature, to hunt souls." But how does your declaration accord with what you say in your preface, that "all religious opinions are *rightly* brought to the test of the Sacred Book"? Do you imagine that this test, like the bed of Procrustes, stretches or contracts itself to the doctrine of every denomination, so as to make it conformable to the gospel standard?

Again; "The views thus entertained by the Society of Friends, on the subject of worship, arise from the entirely spiritual principles, as we deem them, of the christian dispensation. We conceive, however, that the divine Author and Minister of that dispensation not only brought to light and instituted among his followers the highest standard of divine worship, but promulgated also a perfect code of practical morality. It is the deliberate opinion of Friends,—an opinion which they have often found it their duty to declare,—that this moral code ought to be maintained by the followers of Jesus, in *all its original purity;* that no compromise ought to be made between the law of the world and the law of God; that the latter can never rightly yield either to the dictates of human wisdom, or to the requisitions of apparent expediency. In consequence of the impression made on our minds by this general sentiment, (a sentiment which, however far it may be from being confined to ourselves, is probably maintained in our society with a more than common degree of completeness,) we have been led to avoid various practices which are still usual, not only among worldly minded persons, but among many sincere and even pious christians. We conceive it to be in true consistency with the requisitions of the divine will, when rightly understood, that we abstain from lowering the standard of *truth*, and from a presumptuous cursing of self, by the utterance of oaths; from infringing the law of *love* by taking any part either in offensive or in defensive warfare; from fomenting the pride of man by the use of flattering titles and expressions in their nature wholly complimentary; from addressing to mortals those acts of reverence which are on other occasions employed to mark our allegiance to the Deity himself; from gratifying our own vanity by the useless ornamenting of the person or the apparel; and from a conformity with some other common customs which we consider to have an evil tendency."†

* Ezek. xiii. 18.

† Page 352.

How strange, sir, is your proceeding! While contending for what you call the "highest standard of worship," you are yet so lax as to allow men to measure themselves by themselves, and to style every denomination of professors christians, supposing that if they are but *sincere*, they come up to the "mark," and you can from your heart bid them "God speed.'"* Thus you admit of any compromise between the worship instituted by men, and that instituted by God, though you admit of none between the law of the world and the law of God, evidently preferring the law to the gospel. And as to the peculiarities of which you boast, as touching the law, what is the result of them, but making "clean the outside of the cup and of the platter"? Neither morality nor immorality affects the standard of truth; that admits of no variation; even you yourself say, quoting Deut. iv. 2, Rev. xxii. 18, 19, "*Man*, on his own authority and wisdom, must abstain from all tampering with the Book of the Lord."† Immorality condemns a man, but morality does not save him. "Whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace."‡ Nevertheless, "the law is good, if a man use it lawfully; knowing this," says Paul, "that the law is not made for the righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for man-slayers, for whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for man-stealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine, according to the glorious gospel of the blessed God."§ Truly may it be said, Immorality kills its thousands, but false worship its tens of thousands.

Cursing and swearing in common conversation, as well as all voluntary cursing and swearing, is sinful.‖ Yet, seeing what countenance is in the Old Testament given to oaths, and that they were actually commanded of God;¶ seeing also that in the New Testament their usefulness is admitted;** that our Lord himself answered upon the oath put to him by the high priest,†† may we not safely come to the conclusion that they cannot in themselves be wrong; that the prohibition of them does not extend to oaths which may be required for the well-being of society; but that, beyond this, whatsoever is more than yea and nay is evil? The great objection to oaths, as administered by the law of this country, is the irreverent

* See Puseyism traced to its Root, page 58. † Ibid., page 6.
‡ Gal. v. 4. § 1 Tim. i. 8—11. ‖ Jer. xxiii. 10, 11; Matt. v. 34—37.
¶ See Exod. xxii. 11, and Num. v. 19—21. ** Heb. vi. 16.
†† Matthew xxvi. 63, 64.

manner in which they are put; and also, that they are alike required on the most important and the most insignificant occasion—in a case of murder, and in one of stealing a pocket-handkerchief. By this they are deprived of their solemnity, and lead many to disregard them. The administering an oath in a court of justice or elsewhere, on all trifling occasions, is a breach of the third commandment, and the practice ought therefore to be discontinued.

Taking any part in offensive or defensive warfare, is not "infringing the law of love," as it is laid down in the gospel, although it may, in a remote sense, savour some little of it: for "this (says John,) is love, that we walk after his commandments."* "God is love;"† and his well-beloved Son says, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye (*i. e.*, the saints,) love one another; as I have loved you, that ye also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another."‡ The love inculcated in the gospel is of a very different and much higher nature than you imagine it to be.§ You, sir, violate altogether the law of love, not only by traducing the ordinances of Christ, on which his gospel is founded, but by persuading others to traduce them also. And then, by professing to take no part in warfare, you sooth your conscience, and persuade yourself that you are fulfilling it. Thus, I fear, sir, you come under the reproach which our Lord applied to the Pharisees, and must rank as one of the "blind guides, which strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel."‖ As long as the world continues as it is at present, involved in sin, we must, as a natural consequence, have war.¶ War is a rod in the hand of the Almighty, for punishing kingdoms. When the iniquity of the seven nations inhabiting Canaan was full, the Lord sent the Israelites to destroy them; and when Israel sinned, the Lord sent the Assyrians against them. For the same cause also the Assyrians were swept from the face of the earth. David, the man "after God's own heart," was, in the matter of Uriah, punished in like manner; for it was declared unto him, "The sword shall never depart from thine house."** At the present day, also, and doubtless for the same purpose, the Lord sometimes raises up one nation against another, and at other times divides a nation against itself. It is true, the time is approaching when men shall beat their swords

* 2 John 6. † 1 John iv. 16. ‡ John xiii. 34, 35.
§ See 1 Cor. xiii. ‖ Matt. xxiii. 24.
¶ See Matt. xxiv. 4—14; James iv. 1, 2. ** 2 Sam. xii. 10.

into plow-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks;"* but before that time come, it is equally true that they shall beat "their plow-shares into swords, and their pruning-hooks into spears."† See the opening of the seals, the sounding of the seven trumpets, and the pouring out of the vials of wrath, as mentioned in the Revelation. While the commandments and ordinances of Christ are held in so little esteem as they now are, wickedness must naturally increase, and wars, and the day of reckoning, as naturally follow.‡

War cannot cease so long as an Amalekite remains in the land.§ And the proceedings of neighbouring nations, and above all those of our native Isle, are ample proofs that the time has not yet arrived, nor expected soon to arrive, when nations shall not "learn war any more."‖

No christian can advocate war, but every christian ought to love the country that gives him birth, and secures to him the privileges of his birthright. The Israelites were commanded to seek the peace of Babylon, and pray for it, even though it held them in captivity, under the promise that in its peace they should have peace.¶ How much more, then, should a christian seek and pray for the peace of his own country, that he also may have peace; and in the event of war, although he could not voluntarily enter himself as a fighting man, yet, should a *levy en masse* be called, he could not err in obeying the commands of his sovereign, and joining to protect his own hearth. The people mentioned in Neh. iv. 14—23, knew that they were protected of God; but they knew, also, that their being so protected did not exempt them from using all the means he had put in their own power to protect themselves. And they were the same people who, when they had permission to leave Babylon and go to Jerusalem, with all their treasure, were "ashamed to require of the king a band of soldiers and horsemen, to help them against the enemy in the way, because they had spoken unto the king, saying, The hand of our God is upon all them for good that seek him."**

Neither can the Christian err by paying the same taxes which are by law exacted from all, no matter for what purpose.†† In what condition, sir, would our island be, if all its inhabitants were to follow your example? Where would be our ships, our colonies, our commerce? where our independence? where the means of sending the scriptures to all nations? those very means for which we are pre-

* Isa. ii. 4. † Joel iii. 10—17. ‡ See Isa. i. 28.
§ See Exod. xvii. 14—16; Num. xxiv. 20. ‖ Isa. ii. 4.
¶ Jer. xxix. 7. ** Ezra viii. 22. †† See Matt. xvii. 25—27.

served as a people, and made the masters of the world,—means which shall eventually lead to the enjoyment by other lands of the blessings which we ourselves now enjoy, and in the furtherance of which, the Lord is doubtless guiding us, as he did Cyrus of old,* to fight his battles, keeping all nations in awe of us. We must never forget that we are indebted for all our prosperity, and all our victories, to his bountiful and powerful hand; but always bear in mind the fate of the Assyrian, whom God sent to punish the Israelites, but whom he afterwards destroyed, because the Assyrian attributed the power to himself, saying, "By the strength of my hand I have done it; and by my wisdom, for I am prudent,... and have robbed their treasures, and I have put down the inhabitants like a valiant man."†

But I have read, sir, that in the rebellion of '45, the Society of Friends,—when war was at their doors,—acted like good citizens, and raised a subscription to supply the troops with "flannel waistcoats for thewinter." Now, permit me to ask, if nerving the arm to wield the sword or handle the musket is not of far greater utility than is either the sword or the musket of itself? and if your society did not as directly countenance the war, by subscribing for flannel waistcoats, as if they had subscribed for swords and bayonets?

The apostle Paul exhorts "every soul to be subject unto the higher powers. ... Whosoever, therefore," says he, "resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God. ...Wherefore, ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues, tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour."‡ Paul doubtless came into the presence of Festus in the customary respectful manner; his conduct corresponded to his precept, and he therefore addressed him as "most noble."§ And when he was accused of reviling the man whom the Jews called God's high priest, he replied, that "he wist not that he was the high priest; for," said he, "it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people."‖ Luke also, writing to Theophilus, addresses him as "most excellent." Not to come into the presence of those whom the Lord hath in his wisdom set over us, in the respectful and courteous manner of our country, with the head uncovered, addressing them according to their respective

* Isa. xlv. 1—6. † Isa. x. 5—19. ‡ Rom. xiii. 1—7.
§ Acts xxvi. 25. ‖ Acts xxiii. 2—5.

titles, is stiffneckedness, rather than love to God. I must, however, except the titles which are conferred on the clergy, and which the clergy arrogate to themselves; such as, "right reverend father in God," "right reverend," and "reverend," because "holy and reverend" are titles of the Most High.* Yet, as it is now a pretty general custom for the world to give to most preachers, and for preachers to take, the name of "reverend," the word has become so hackneyed as to have lost its original signification, and therefore much of its objectionable character, being now used only to distinguish the clergy from the laity; just as superstition gives to churches the name of some actual or nominal saint, by which one may be distinguished from the other. Such, indeed, has become the force of custom, that if we did not use the term, we should often find a difficulty in making ourselves understood; and if we had occasion to write to one whom the world denominates a divine, and did not prefix the term reverend to his name, the probability is, that our letter would not find him, or, if it did, that we should give offence, and receive no answer.

Then, with respect to dress, I am not aware that believers are anywhere in the scriptures forbidden the use of that which is becoming and suitable, according to the custom of the country, and the stations of life in which their heavenly Father has seen good to place them. There is, indeed, a happy medium between extreme plainness and foppery in man, and between the want of neatness and the extreme of fashion in woman; and this medium ought to be attended to. Our "moderation must be known to all." We must not make ourselves slaves to, nor be "puffed up" by, the fashion of the world; the sinfulness of dress consists in our dressing out of character, or in excess. Our Lord speaks against peculiarity, and in favour of a customary appearance.† John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, "coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband."‡ From this passage, we see that suitable and becoming attention to outward appearance is in accordance with, while any peculiarity respecting it is contrary to, the precepts of scripture.§ I know not to what other common customs you allude, as differing from the world at large, except that of your manner of expression; and this approximates as much to a pharisaical spirit as does your dress. Your houses are as commodious, and as handsomely furnished, as those of any

* Psalm cxi. 9.
† Matt. vi. 17, 18.
‡ Rev. xxi. 2.
§ See Matt. xxiii. 5.

other people; your cellars are as well stocked, your gardens as tastefully laid out, your hothouses and greenhouses as well filled with choice fruits and rare plants, your carriages as good looking and dignified, your horses as fine and well harnessed, and your coachmen and servants equally so, save the difference in the livery.

"I may," you say,* "venture with humility to express my own sentiment, that Friends, viewed as a distinct fraternity in the church universal, have been brought to a greater degree of religious light, and to juster views of the true standard of worship and conduct, than any other class or denomination of christians with whom I have the privilege of being acquainted....While I am far from depreciating the usefulness of any existing class of serious christians, and while I believe that they are severally permitted to occupy appropriate departments in the fold of the Great Shepherd, I nevertheless entertain the sentiment (in unison, it may be hoped, with the views of many of my readers,) that a peculiar importance attaches to the station maintained in the church of Christ by the pious among Friends; and for this reason, that they appear to be the appointed depositories of certain plain practical christian truths, which are at present far from being generally received, but which, originating in the will of God, as it is both inwardly and outwardly revealed, may be expected, as the church on earth gradually advances to a condition of greater spirituality, to become more widely disseminated, and more fully allowed."

Hitherto, sir, you have not ventured upon one positive assertion. All that you have previously advanced rests on no better authority than such expressions as the following: "it is probable"—or, "it may be admitted as a probability"—or, "it is nearly indisputable"—or, "we may fairly conclude"—or, "they appear to afford"—or, "the reader will probably allow"—or, "I would suggest"! Such doubtful expressions as these, sir, continually occur in your work; and they sufficiently prove your lack of confidence in your own principles; that you have no determinate, no distinct views of the doctrine of the gospel; and that, in divine things, you have not attained to any degree of certainty. In the paragraph just quoted, however, you advance a step, and venture upon something like positive assertion. "Friends," you say, "viewed as a distinct fraternity in the church universal, have been brought to a greater degree of religious light, and to juster views of the true standard of worship and con-

* Page 356.

duct, than any other class or denomination of christians." But then, sir, all this is sheer assumption. You have furnished no proof of it; and I can safely affirm, that no passage of scripture, taken in its full connexion, will bear you out, or show your superiority, or favour your peculiarities. We do not read in the gospel of "distinct fraternities," nor of different classes and denominations of christians. It is said in Zephaniah, "Then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with *one consent*."* And again, in Jeremiah, "I will give them *one heart*, and *one way*, that they may fear me for ever; for the good of them, and for their children after them."† These two passages overturn your whole theory; and our Lord, speaking of an individual who is labouring under a false illumination, says, "If ... the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness."‡

Unity of mind and judgment, is the distinguishing characteristic of the church of Christ. Our Lord, praying to the Father, says, "That they all may be one, as thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.... And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them, that they may be one, even as we are one."§ Paul also says, "There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord, one faith, one baptism."‖ And again, "I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together, in the same mind and in the same judgment."¶ And again, "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel. Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preached any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again; If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."** John follows up the subject, and says, "Little children, it is the last time, and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists.... They went out from us, but they were not of

* Zeph. iii. 9. † Jer. xxxii. 39. ‡ Matt. vi. 23.
§ John xvii. 21, 22. Ephes. iv. 4, 5.
¶ 1 Cor. i. 10. ** Gal. i. 6, 9.

us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out, that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us. But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things."* "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God, and eternal life."† "In him was life, and the life was the light of men. ... That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."‡ This, sir, is the light that then shone, that now shineth, and that will shine for evermore; and those who are enlightened by its rays do now, and shall to the end of time, speak the same language, and serve the Lord with the same consent, rejecting the peculiarities of every sect, which are not in harmony with the gospel of Christ.

"Under the Old Testament dispensation, a perfect and finished pattern was at once shown to Moses in the mount, by which he constructed the tabernacle. But the pattern for the order of worship in the true tabernacle, the church of Christ, was gradually formed by the ministry of Christ and that of his apostles, and continued to receive additions as occasion required, until infallibility ceased with the apostolic office. A closer and more diligent examination, therefore, is now necessary, in order to become acquainted with it. And as ancient Israel, the type of the church of Christ, was the conservator of the laws of the Old Testament, so is its antitype, the true church, the conservator of the laws of the New. These laws, dictated by the Spirit of God, contain everything requisite for the salvation of man. The New Testament was finished by the Revelation of John, and the seal of completion being affixed to it, the Most High has never added to it, and he never will." For thus "saith the Son of God, who hath his eyes like unto a flame of fire, and his feet are like fine brass.... That which ye already have, hold fast till I come."§ So that whosoever shall now pretend to receive any instruction from heaven, otherwise than through the scriptures, let his pretensions to godliness be what they may, is either a deceiver, or under the influence of a spirit of delusion, and by consequence an enemy to the Father, to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life."‖

* 1 John ii. 18—20. † 1 John v. 20. ‡ John i. 4. 9.
§ Rev. ii. 18. 25. ‖ John vi. 63.

"Since," you go on to say,* "we have so much reason to be convinced that these religious peculiarities have originated, not in the imagination of men, but in the will of God; that we have been led into the practice of them by the Spirit of truth; that they accord with the dictates of the divine law, as it is recorded in the scriptures; that they are of an edifying tendency, and are calculated to promote the spiritual welfare both of our own society and of the church at large; and, finally, that they are in a particular manner deposited in our keeping; it unquestionably becomes us to maintain them, during our walk through life, with simplicity, sincerity, firmness, and diligence."

We know, sir, that the tables of the covenant were kept in the tabernacle, in the holiest of all;† that Joshua read all the words of the law before all the congregation;‡ that it was customary to read the law and the prophets in the synagogues every sabbath-day;§ that our Lord, on the sabbath-day, read out of the book in the synagogue of Nazareth,‖ and instituted the supper in a private chamber;¶ that the apostles preached Christ, and celebrated the supper, in private houses, on the Lord's-day;** that they preached Christ of their own knowledge, "the Lord confirming the word with signs following;"†† and that afterwards, all that was necessary for our instruction and salvation was collected and handed down, in writing, together with the writings of the Old Testament; we know also that the whole now makes One Book, which is the sole directory of the people of God; that it is written in language so plain that "the wayfaring man, though a fool, shall not err therein;"‡‡ and that in whatever hands this book is deposited, the individual, if able to read it, becomes responsible, if he does not make himself familiar with its contents, and walk according to its dictates. By it he is warned to be on his guard against any who say, "Lo, here is Christ, or there."§§ Ignorance in such a case can be no excuse for him; for his own wilfulness prevents him from searching it "with the whole heart."

But you assert, sir, that your society is in a particular manner the depository of what is recorded in the scriptures; while at the same time your assertion is disproved by your mode of worship, which neither accords with that of the old, nor that of new, dispen-

* Page 359. † Heb. ix. 3, 4. ‡ Josh. viii. 35.
§ Acts xiii. 15—27. ‖ Luke iv. 16—19. ¶ Mark xiv. 14.
** Acts ii. 46; and xx. 7, 8. †† Mark xvi. 20. ‡‡ Isa. xxxv. 8.
§§ See Matt. xxiv. 23—25.

sation. You permit neither the law nor the gospel to be read in your meeting-houses, nor allow the Divine record a place in them. Nay, an accredited minister of your body, (if you will allow of such an appellation,) having published a work in defence of the Bible, was *recommended* to suppress it, and rather than do this he resigned his connexion with you. A number of your members, also, who were in the habit of meeting together to study the scriptures, were called to account for it: and it is reported that you were one of the committee, (and the organ of it,) appointed by the yearly meeting, to visit the Lancashire quarterly meeting where this took place, the result being that forty-eight members resigned. That your society holds doctrines most repugnant to the gospel, and most ruinous to the souls of men, I cannot better illustrate than by giving, as specimens of the whole, the following abridged selections of six, taken from the forty, published resignations, as addressed "To Hardshaw East Monthly Meeting of Friends," with the names attached, as published in a work entitled, "The Crisis of the Quaker Contest," part 3d, dated 1837.

The appendix, in which the resignations are found, is thus prefaced: "In order to furnish the reader with means of judging for himself, what are the grounds on which so many persons in Manchester have left the society, it was deemed desirable that their resignations should be published."

Isaac Crewdson wrote—"I was aware when, in the beginning of 1835, I published the Beacon, that Hicksism did exist to some extent among Friends in this country, and I believed that, under different modifications, many held the unscriptural and dangerous doctrine of the 'Inward Light,' *the very root of the heresy* promulgated by Hicks: and my design in publishing the work was, that Friends should be warned of the danger: and I did hope that in having before them the deadly errors of Hicksism, in contrast with the *truth of God*, as revealed in Holy Scripture, if in any respect they should see their own faces as in a glass, their hearts might be inclined to receive the warning, and to take the scripture ground. I had little idea that a scriptural book, (and such it proved to be on a stern and rigid examination,) would so generally throughout the society have been met with decided hostility. Even so lately as when I wrote the first part of my Reply to the Statement of the Committee, I confess I had a very inadequate idea of the radical unsoundness of the system, and I fondly hoped that the scriptures might

yet be admitted (practically I mean,) as the paramount standard; and that, unitedly fleeing to the refuge set before us in the gospel, we might have striven together for the faith once delivered to the saints; and it is but very lately that the deep and painful conviction has been forced upon me with *irresistible evidence*, that quakerism, as set forth in some of the writings of George Fox, and other early Friends, is not christianity, and that some of his delusive assumptions were of a truly awful and even blasphemous character. The recent proceedings of the Yearly Meetings' Committee evince a determination to stop all enquiry, and to frustrate every effort to inform the body....I now resign my membership."

William Boulton—"I believe it to be inconsistent with the nature of a christian church, that membership should be confirmed by birth. ...The doctrine of the 'Inward Light,' as held by the society, I am fully persuaded tends to the introduction of another gospel than that of the Lord Jesus Christ; and that seeking to be guided by a principle within, instead of the directions of the Bible, subverts, by a subtle but almost certain process, the authority of scripture, while thus the dictates of imagination come to be regarded as of equal weight with the written word of God. I know that this tendency will be denied, but it can never be disproved. And I moreover solemnly believe that there never was a principle more insidious in its influence, or calculated to be more mischievous in its effects.

"The grand scriptural doctrine, on the other hand, of justification by faith alone, I lament to have found seldom preached in the meetings of Friends, and although many profess to embrace it, yet with the majority, even of those, that doctrine appears to me to be adulterated by a reliance, in part at least, on their own obedience....I believe what are commonly termed the peculiarities of Friends, with but few exceptions, to have no authority in scripture, but that they are a yoke and a bondage which the gospel has not imposed, and that their effect is to foster pharisaic pride. Young people, espe cially, I conceive to be thereby trained up to act from the motive of 'being seen of men,'...therefore, I am led, as the result of close and anxious investigation, pursued in opposition to all my prepossessions and attachments, to declare that my connexion with the society must henceforth be dissolved."

William Nield—"The kind and feeling consideration which you evinced in two cases of delinquency, the one an individual who had been convicted of purchasing goods not honestly obtained, and

although pronounced guilty by a jury of his countrymen, on their solemn oaths, you thought the whole of the evidence had not been fully examined, and wished the accused to have all the benefit to which he was entitled; the other case was that of an individual who had avowed sceptical opinions of the Christian faith: these claimed, as they deserved, your sympathy; but on the other hand, a brother in religious profession, whose doctrinal views and whose walk in life were admitted to be unimpeachable, and to whose strong desires for the eternal welfare of others I can bear my testimony, from the experience of many years; for him there is no feeling of commiseration, but pains and penalties instead; for him there is no distinct charge or fair trial; for him the common course of the rules and practices of this society, and the universally acknowledged principles of British law, afford no protection, individual right and justice being disregarded: contrast your conduct in these two cases, and ask yourselves if both are right....You say you admit the Holy Scriptures to be the test of christian doctrine; and yet condemn and persecute those who appeal to them as the standard by which they are willing to be tried, and whose lives evidence their love for the truths they preach....I believe nothing but the full persuasion that your proceedings resist the advancement of His kingdom and glory whom I humbly trust I love, could have induced me to take this step....I believe my duty requires it, and I therefore hereby tender my resignation as a member of your society."

Joseph and Anna Crewdson—"We briefly state that we consider the society in serious error, through attaching more importance to impressions made on their own minds, than to the authority of the written revelation. We do not consider silent meetings (for which we find no scriptural authority) calculated either to instruct the ignorant, awaken the careless, or best suited to build up the believer in the faith once delivered to the saints. On the cardinal doctrine of justification by faith alone, the early writers of the society are lamentably unsound; and the same unsoundness is now evinced throughout the society, and particularly in this quarterly meeting, by the crushing oppositions exercised towards those who preach this doctrine in primitive simplicity....We deeply lament that though the society has been induced to make the broad assertion, that there is no other record of faith and doctrine than Holy Scripture, they do not allow it to be a test, where it is at variance with the peculiar views of Friends: these peculiarities being based on the supposed

revelations of George Fox. With unabated love, &c., we resign our membership."

Benjamin Pearson—"The objections that were made to William Boulton, both as an elder and a minister, as soon as he promoted the social study of the Holy Scriptures, in order to fortify the youth against the attacks of sin, (although he was before highly approved in both characters,) and the acceptance of his resignation of the office of an elder, in conformity with the advice of the committee of the yearly meeting, who had previously succeeded in stopping him as a minister, without any complaint against him of inconsistency in conduct, or error in doctrine, is an affecting proof of the enmity that exists in the society to the simple truths of the gospel To the former instances may be added the fact, that individuals have been accepted as fit overseers or pastors, who were unable to perceive the errors of an infidel publication, on such an important subject as the authority of Holy Scripture; and a further proof is afforded, in the yearly meetings' committee having expressed its disapprobation of meetings held on first day evenings, for the public reading of the scriptures, and the offering of christian exhortation or prayer, as ability might be afforded....I therefore request that I may no longer be considered a member of your society."

J. S., A. W., and T. Thorp—"The doctrine of the light within, which has always been the leading principle of quakerism, we believe to be at variance with Holy Scripture, and entirely a delusion; we consider it to be highly pernicious in its tendency, leading persons to their own feelings and imaginations for direction, rather than to the Holy Scriptures....We think there is great want of public scriptural instruction in the society, and that by prohibiting the reading of the Holy Scriptures in meetings for worship, Friends are not only dishonouring the word of God, but also neglecting the most favourable opportunity for promulgating the principles which it contains. The conduct of the yearly meetings' committee during the present controversy, and the support given by the monthly meeting to them in silencing those individuals, who believed it to be their duty to preach the simple gospel of Christ, as well as the great hostility Friends generally have manifested to the Beacon, (a book we believe to be in accordance with Holy Scripture,) have deprived us of all hope that pure evangelical principles will ever be encouraged in the society. We therefore tender the resignation of our membership in the society."

These extracts, sir, bear me out in the view I have taken of your "Observations on the Religious Peculiarities of the Society of Friends." I trust I have made it manifest that your peculiarities are opposed to the word of God; and, consequently, that they have no other foundation than the imagination of man. Our Lord said to his disciples, "Now ye are clean, through the word which I have spoken unto you."* Thus showing that it is only through the knowledge of him,† as taught in his word, that any man can be assured that his sins are blotted out, and that he can "be glad with exceeding joy,"‡ that he is "accepted in the beloved."§ You assume that your peculiarities are in accordance with the scriptures. Well! how do you maintain them? Not, as you profess to do, "with sincerity and firmness," exhorting and reproving the people, when they "turn to the right hand or to the left," and telling them, "This is the way, walk ye in it." No, you praise and flatter *all* whose doctrine is the reverse of that which you maintain. As a proof of this, you assure the great body of the people, whom you accuse of holding dangerous tenets, which lead to *gross superstition*, that you regard them with a friendly eye, and rejoice in the evident extension of *true religion* within their border. Where, then, let me ask, is the faithfulness to the Divine record, of which you, as the organ of your society, boast that it is the depository? How different your conduct from that of Josiah! In his day, the body of the people had departed from the pure worship of God, as the body of the people have now. But as soon as Hilkiah found the book of the law, Josiah sent him and others, saying, "Go ye, enquire of the Lord for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that is found; for great is the wrath of the Lord that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this book, to do according to all that which is written concerning us."¶ He neither courted nor flattered the idolators, nor called them fellow-worshippers, nor told them that they would derive "*real instruction*" and "*edification*" from the observance of ordinances which were not of divine institution. Nor did he deceive the people, by saying that God continues to accept the sincere heart, although not under divine influence: nor that he was still pleased to bless a variety of means to a variety of conditions! No! on the contrary, he rebuked them

* John xv. 3. † Isa. liii. 11. ‡ 1 Peter iv. 13. § Eph. i. 6. Isa. xxx. 21. ¶ 2 Kings xxii. 13.

openly and fearlessly. "He went up into the house of the Lord, and all the men of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him, and the priests and the prophets, and all the people, both small and great, and *he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant which he found in the house of the Lord.* And...he made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, and to keep his commandments, and his testimonies, and his statutes, with all their heart and all their soul, to perform the words of this covenant that were written in this book. And all the people stood to the covenant. And the king commanded Hilkiah, the high priest, and the priests of the second order, and the keepers of the doors, to bring forth out of the temple of the Lord all the vessels that were made for Baal, and for the grove, and for all the host of heaven, and he burned them without Jerusalem.... And he put down the idolatrous priests whom the kings of Judah had ordained to burn incense in the high places in the cities of Judah, and in the places round about Jerusalem.... And all the houses also of the high places that were in the cities of Samaria, which the kings of Israel had made to provoke the Lord to anger, Josiah took away, and did to them according to all the acts that he had done in Bethel.... And the king commanded all the people, saying, *Keep the passover unto the Lord your God, as it is written in the book of the covenant.*... And all the abominations that were spied in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem did Josiah put away, that he might perform the words of the law which were written in the book.... And like unto him there was no king before him, that turned to the Lord with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the law of Moses."* Here then is a pattern for a faithful minister of God to follow. Josiah knew his responsibility, and faithfully performed his Master's will by maintaining the law, according to the book which had been deposited in the house of the Lord. How great the contrast!

Having now weighed your leading doctrines in the "balances" of truth, and found them "wanting," I bring my remarks to a close. The momentous cause *I* have been defending has urged me occasionally to use strong language; but not stronger than the scriptures authorise.* Still, I disclaim all intention of giving personal offence: for although your peculiarities are a multiplication of "abominations," your moral character is, according to all that I

* See 2 Kings xxiii. 2—5. 19. 21. 24, 25.

have heard or read of it, amiable and praiseworthy. I shall be sorry, therefore, if you think me your enemy, because *I* tell you the truth.† My remarks have been directed against your anti-scriptural doctrines, to maintain which, you tyrannize and rule despotically over your people, and, when they remonstrate, in a manner compel them either to be silent, or to quit your society. You have used much personal and commendable exertion, sir, to forward the emancipation of our enslaved fellow-creatures; but you have failed to bear in remembrance, that to enslave the body is a light thing, in comparison to that of enslaving the mind — light as is the chastening of whips compared to the chastening of scorpions. I regret, then, that your conduct has given me occasion to observe, that your exertions have been no more energetic to unrivet the chains from the bodies of one class of men, than they have been to rivet them on the minds of another. So far as you are able, you shut up the kingdom of heaven against men; for you neither go in yourself, nor suffer them that are entering to go in.‡ Your arrival at any town, when you are journeying, is publicly announced, and the inhabitants are invited to attend your "religious gatherings." To hear what? Doctrines in most respects opposed to the doctrines of the gospel, but delivered in such a specious manner, and with so much suavity, that I have heard of some, who were familiar with the scriptures, having had their ears so tickled, as, for the moment, to be charmed by the delusion. Thus, sir, are your discourses more dangerous to the souls of men than those of the atheist; for the world is on its guard against the latter, who never appears in "sheep's clothing."

That your visits should have been repeated, and your doctrines promulgated, year after year, without any one lifting up his voice against them, has been to me a matter of surprise, since every believer is exhorted "earnestly to contend for the faith;"§ and is told that, "it is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing."‖

These considerations, combined with my great regard for the "divine record," have actuated me, in undertaking this important duty. To my knowledge, only a few dissentients from your own

* See Matt. xxiii. 13—38; Gal, i. 8—10; James iv. 4.

† Gal. iv. 16. ‡ Matt. xxiii. 13. § Jude 3.

‖ Gal. iv. 18; see also Numb. xxv. 11, contrasted with Judges v. 23; also Jer. xxiii. 38, 39.

body have attempted it, and that in a partial manner; and while I feel my inability to do justice to the subject, I know also that the Lord frequently executes his designs by means to human perception the most unlikely: it may please him to bless these feeble endeavours, and make me in some measure his humble instrument to frustrate your design, the obvious tendency of which is, to degrade the institutions of the gospel.

If what I have written be the means of preserving one individual from the subtle delusions which your writings contain, and of bringing him to "the knowledge of God;" or if you, sir, should be led thereby to search the scriptures with humility, and with prayer for the enlightening influence of the Spirit of Truth, to lead you into a knowledge of the true design of the gospel institutions, and to fill you "with the knowledge of his will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding,"* I shall be amply recompensed; and the Lord God shall have all the praise.

I am, Sir,

Your Friend,

SEACOME ELLISON.

Walton, near Liverpool,
May 30th, 1846.

* 1 Col. i. 9.

D. MARPLES, PRINTER, LIVERPOOL.